arXiv:1610.01263v3 [math.PR] 29 Dec 2016

Sharp interface limit for stochastically perturbed mass conserving Allen-Cahn equation

Tadahisa Funaki[1)] and Satoshi Yokoyama[2)]

December 30, 2016

Abstract

This paper studies the sharp interface limit for a mass conserving Allen-Cahn equation added an external noise and derives a stochastically perturbed mass conserving mean curvature flow in the limit. The stochastic term destroys the precise conservation law, instead the total mass changes like a Brownian motion in time. For our equation, the comparison argument does not work, so that to study the limit we adopt the asymptotic expansion method, which extends that for deterministic equations used in Chen et al. [3]. Differently from the deterministic case, each term except the leading term appearing in the expansion of the solution in a small parameter ε diverges as ε tends to 0, since our equation contains the noise which converges to a white noise and the products or the powers of the white noise diverge. To derive the error estimate for our asymptotic expansion, we need to establish the Schauder estimate for a diffusion operator with coefficients determined from higher order derivatives of the noise and their powers. We show that one can choose the noise sufficiently mild in such a manner that it converges to the white noise and at the same time its diverging speed is slow enough for establishing a necessary error estimate.

1 Introduction and main results

First, we introduce the stochastic mass conserving Allen-Cahn equation. Our goal is to discuss its sharp interface limit. The mass conservation law forces us to introduce a scaling for the noise different from the stochastic Allen-Cahn equation and prevents the comparison argument, which was useful for the stochastic Allen-Cahn equation. Our method is the asymptotic expansion, in which powers of derivatives of the noise appear repeatedly, and our main effort is devoted to controlling these diverging terms. The evolutional law of the limit hypersurface is described by the mass conserving mean curvature flow with a nonlocal multiplicative white noise term.

[1),2)] Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences, The University of Tokyo, Komaba, Tokyo 153-8914, Japan. e-mails: funaki@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp, satoshi2@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Keywords: Sharp interface limit, Allen-Cahn equation, Mean curvature flow, Asymptotic expansion, Mass conservation law, Stochastic perturbation

Abbreviated title (running head): Sharp interface limit for stochastic mass conserving Allen-Cahn equation

2010MSC: primary 60H15, secondary 35K93, 74A50.

The author[1)] is supported in part by the JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers (B) 26287014 and 26610019.

1.1 Stochastic mass conserving Allen-Cahn equation and its background

We consider the solution $u = u^\varepsilon(t,x)$ of the following stochastic partial differential equation (1.1) in a bounded domain D in $\mathbb{R}^n$ having a smooth boundary ∂D:

$$
(1.1)\qquad \begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial u^\varepsilon}{\partial t} = \Delta u^\varepsilon + \varepsilon^{-2}\left(f(u^\varepsilon) - \fint_D f(u^\varepsilon)\right) + \alpha \dot{w}^\varepsilon(t), & \text{in } D\times\mathbb{R}_+, \\ \dfrac{\partial u^\varepsilon}{\partial \nu} = 0, & \text{on } \partial D\times\mathbb{R}_+, \\ u^\varepsilon(0,\cdot) = g^\varepsilon(\cdot), & \text{in } D, \end{cases}
$$

where $\varepsilon > 0$ is a small parameter, $\alpha > 0$, ν is the inward normal vector on ∂D, $\mathbb{R}_+ = [0,\infty)$,

$$
\fint_D f(u^\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{|D|}\int_D f(u^\varepsilon(t,x))dx,
$$

g^ε are continuous functions having the property (1.12) stated below, or more precisely, satisfying the conditions (4.28)–(4.30). The noise $\dot{w}^\varepsilon(t)$ is the derivative of $w^\varepsilon(t) \equiv w^\varepsilon(t,\omega) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+)$ in t defined on a certain probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ such that $w^\varepsilon(t)$ converges to a one-dimensional standard Brownian motion $w(t)$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ in a suitable sense; see (1.8) and Assumption 1.1 below. We assume that the reaction term $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is bistable and satisfies the following three conditions:

(i) $f(\pm 1) = 0$, $f'(\pm 1) < 0$, $\displaystyle\int_{-1}^{1} f(u)du = 0$,

(ii) f has only three zeros ± 1 and one another between ± 1,

(iii) there exists $\bar{c}_1 > 0$ such that $f'(u) \le \bar{c}_1$ for every $u \in \mathbb{R}$.

The last equality in (i) is called the balance condition. A typical example is $f(u) = u - u^3$. From (i) and (ii), it follows that there exists a unique increasing solution m: $\mathbb{R} \longrightarrow (-1,1)$ of

$$
(1.2)\qquad m'' + f(m) = 0 \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}, \quad m(\pm\infty) = \pm 1, \quad m(0) = 0,
$$

and m is called the traveling wave (or standing wave) solution. The function $m = m(\rho), \rho \in \mathbb{R}$, satisfies

$$
(1.3)\qquad \partial_\rho^k(m(\rho) \mp 1) = O(e^{-\zeta|\rho|}), \quad \text{as } \rho \to \pm\infty,
$$

for $k = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$, where $\zeta = \min\{\sqrt{-f'(-1)}, \sqrt{-f'(1)}\} > 0$.

For a mass conserving Allen-Cahn equation without noise, that is (1.1) with $\alpha = 0$, the existence and uniqueness results are established by [4], [5], [16] and its sharp interface limit as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ is studied by Chen et al. [3]. On the other hand, for a stochastic Allen-Cahn equation, that is (1.1) without the averaged reaction term, the sharp interface limit is studied by Funaki [9], [10], Lions and Souganidis [18] and Weber [21]; see also [11], [12] which give a brief survey. The study of the sharp interface limit of the stochastic mass conserving Allen-Cahn equation (1.1) is a natural extension and combination of these two problems. Note that the noise term considered in [10], [21] was scaled as $\varepsilon^{-1}\alpha\dot{w}^\varepsilon(t)$. This

is very different from $\alpha\dot{w}^\varepsilon(t)$ in (1.1). In other words, our dynamics is more sensitive to the noise. We will give a heuristic explanation for this difference in Section 2.1. Note also that the comparison argument used in [10], [21] does not work for the equation (1.1). This is the main technical difference between our equation and the stochastic Allen-Cahn equation.

1.2 Limit dynamics, conservation law and related results

Our goal is to show that the solution $u^\varepsilon(t,x)$ of (1.1) converges as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ to $\chi_{\gamma_t}(x)$ with certain hypersurface γ_t in D, where $\chi_\gamma(x) = +1$ or -1 according to the outside or inside of the hypersurface γ, if this holds for the initial data g^ε with a certain γ_0, and the time evolution of γ_t is governed by

$$V = \kappa - \fint_{\gamma_t} \kappa + \frac{\alpha|D|}{2|\gamma_t|} \circ \dot{w}(t), \quad t \in [0,\sigma], \tag{1.4}$$

up to a certain stopping time $\sigma > 0$ (a.s.), where V is the inward normal velocity of γ_t, κ represents the mean curvature of γ_t multiplied by $n-1$, $\fint_{\gamma_t} \kappa = \frac{1}{|\gamma_t|}\int_{\gamma_t} \kappa d\bar{s}$, $\dot{w}(t)$ is the white noise process and $\circ$ means the Stratonovich stochastic integral. When $\alpha = 0$, the equation (1.4) coincides with the limit of the mass conserving Allen-Cahn equation studied in [3]. Note that, in [3], the sign of V is taken opposite. When $\alpha = 0$, the mass of the solution u^ε of (1.1) is conserved, namely,

$$\frac{1}{|D|}\int_D u^\varepsilon(t,x)dx = C, \tag{1.5}$$

holds for some constant $C \in \mathbb{R}$. On the other hand, in the case where the fluctuation caused by $\alpha w^\varepsilon(t)$ is added, the rigid mass conservation law is destroyed and in place of (1.5), we have the conservation law in a stochastic sense

$$\frac{1}{|D|}\int_D u^\varepsilon(t,x)dx = C + \alpha w^\varepsilon(t), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+, \tag{1.6}$$

which can be derived by integrating (1.1) over D:

$$\frac{1}{|D|}\int_D \Big(\partial_t u^\varepsilon(t,x) - \alpha\dot{w}^\varepsilon(t)\Big)dx = 0. \tag{1.7}$$

The equation (1.6) implies that the total mass per volume behaves like a Brownian motion multiplied by α as ε tends to 0.

The equation (1.1) with $\alpha = 0$ and without the averaged reaction term is called the Allen-Cahn equation. It is well-known that the mean curvature flow $V = \kappa$ appears in the limit for this equation; cf., [1], [12]. For the stochastic Allen-Cahn equation, i.e., (1.1) without the averaged reaction term and with the noise differently scaled as we mentioned above, the limit dynamics is given by $V = \kappa + \bar{\sigma}\alpha\dot{w}(t)$, where $\bar{\sigma}$ is the inverse surface tension defined below, see [10], (1.5). In this case, a simple additive noise appears in the limit, while in our case the limit dynamics (1.4) has a multiplicative noise and its coefficient contains a nonlocal term $|\gamma_t|^{-1}$. This is due to the effect of the conservation law.

1.3 Formulation of main results

We take an integer K satisfying $K > \max(n+2, 6)$ and fix it throughout the paper. This will be necessary for the proof of Theorem 4.9 later. Let $w^\varepsilon = w^\varepsilon(t) \equiv w^\varepsilon(t,\omega)$, $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $\omega \in \Omega$ be a family of $(\mathcal{F}_t)$-adapted stochastic processes defined on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ equipped with the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}$, which satisfy that $w^\varepsilon(0) = 0$, $w^\varepsilon(\cdot) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+)$ in t a.s. ω and

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \|w^\varepsilon - w\|_{C^\theta([0,T])} = 0, \quad \text{a.s.}, \tag{1.8}$$

for every $T > 0$ and some $\theta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, where $w(t)$ is an $(\mathcal{F}_t)$-Brownian motion satisfying $w(0) = 0$ and

$$\|u\|_{C^\theta([0,T])} = \sup_{t\in[0,T]} |u(t)| + \sup_{\substack{0\leq s,t\leq T \\ s\neq t}} \frac{|u(t)-u(s)|}{|t-s|^\theta}. \tag{1.9}$$

To prove our main theorem, we need two assumptions formulated as follows:

Assumption 1.1. *For every $T > 0$, there exists $H_\varepsilon \geq 1, 0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, such that*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T],\,\omega\in\Omega} |\frac{d^k}{dt^k} w^\varepsilon(t,\omega)| \leq H_\varepsilon, \quad k = 1, 2, \cdots, n_1(K)+1, \tag{1.10}$$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0} H_\varepsilon = \infty, \quad \lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0} \frac{H_\varepsilon^{2n_1(K)}}{\log\log|\log\varepsilon|} = 0, \tag{1.11}$$

where $n_1(K) \in \mathbb{N}$ is the number determined from K by Proposition 3.6 below.

Two examples of our mild noise w^ε satisfying (1.8) and Assumption 1.1 will be given in Section 4.1.

Assumption 1.2. *There exist stopping times σ^ε and σ such that $V^{\alpha\dot{w}^\varepsilon}$ (resp. V), the solution of (2.6) below with $v = \alpha\dot{w}^\varepsilon$ (resp. (1.4)), exists uniquely in $[0, \sigma^\varepsilon]$ (resp. $[0,\sigma]$). In addition, $\sigma^\varepsilon > 0$ and $\sigma > 0$ hold* a.s. *Furthermore, for every $T > 0$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, the joint variable $(\sigma^\varepsilon, d^\varepsilon(t\wedge\sigma^\varepsilon)) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times C([0,T], C^m(\mathcal{O}))$ converges in this space to $(\sigma, d(t\wedge\sigma))$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ in* a.s.*-sense, where $d^\varepsilon(t)$ (resp. $d(t)$) is the signed distance determined by the hypersurface $\gamma_t^{\alpha\dot{w}^\varepsilon}$ (resp. γ_t), which is negative inside $\gamma_t^{\alpha\dot{w}^\varepsilon}$ (resp. γ_t), and $\mathcal{O}$ is an open neighborhood of γ_0; see Theorem 1.1 and [21].*

We will show in Section 5 that Assumption 1.2 holds in law sense under a two-dimensional setting as long as the limit curve γ_t is convex. Applying Skorohod's representation theorem for joint variables $(w^\varepsilon, \sigma^\varepsilon, d^\varepsilon(t\wedge\sigma^\varepsilon))$, by changing the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ if necessary, one can realize the convergence in a.s.-sense as in (1.8) and Assumption 1.2.

Assumption 1.2 implies uniform bounds on spatial derivatives of the distance functions in $\varepsilon > 0$ locally in time, see Section 3.3.1. We also need bounds on t-derivatives of the hypersurface $\gamma_t^{\alpha\dot{w}^\varepsilon}$ by means of a certain norm of the noise $\dot{w}^\varepsilon$. This will be formulated precisely as Assumption 3.1 in Section 3.3.2 and shown under two-dimensional settings in Section 5.

The aim of this paper is to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1. *Let γ_0 be a smooth hypersurface in D without boundary with finitely many connected components and it has the form $\gamma_0 = \partial D_0$ with a smooth domain D_0 such that $\overline{D}_0 \subset D$. Suppose that a local solution $\Gamma = \cup_{0\le t<\sigma}(\gamma_t \times \{t\})$ of (1.4) up to the stopping time $\sigma > 0$ (a.s.) satisfying $\gamma_t \subset D$ for all $t \in [0, \sigma]$ uniquely exists (a.s.). Furthermore, let us assume three Assumptions 1.1, 1.2 and 3.1. Then, one can find a family of continuous functions $\{g^\varepsilon(\cdot)\}_{\varepsilon\in(0,1]}$ satisfying*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0} g^\varepsilon(x) = \chi_{\gamma_0}, \tag{1.12}$$

such that $u^\varepsilon(t \wedge \sigma^\varepsilon \wedge \tau, \cdot)$ converges to $\chi_{\gamma_{t\wedge\sigma\wedge\tau}}(\cdot)$ in $C(\mathbb{R}_+, L^2(D))$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ in a.s.*-sense, where u^ε is the solution of (1.1) with initial value g^ε and $\tau = \tau(\omega) > 0$ is that given below Assumption 3.1.*

If Assumption 1.2 holds in law sense, by the observation we gave above, Theorem 1.1 holds also in law sense. More precise conditions for g^ε are formulated in (4.28)–(4.30).

The right hand side of the first equation in (1.1) contains the averaged reaction term, and hence, as we already pointed out, one cannot directly apply the comparison principle to estimate its solution. This is a difference from the stochastic Allen-Cahn equation treated in [10], [21]. Our method for the proof of Theorem 1.1 is an extension of the asymptotic expansion used in [3]. Recall that $w(t)$ is not in C^1-class in t and therefore for any smooth sequence $\{w^\varepsilon(t)\}_{0<\varepsilon\le 1}$ converging toward $w(t)$, the products or the powers of its time derivative $\{\dot{w}^\varepsilon(t)\}_{0<\varepsilon\le 1}$ and higher order time derivatives always diverge as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$. Due to this, each term in inner and outer solutions constructed by the asymptotic expansion except its leading term explodes as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ because it contains some powers of the time derivatives of w^ε. However, by choosing the sequence $\dot{w}^\varepsilon(t)$ in a suitable manner that its divergent speed is slow enough as in Assumption 1.1, one can control the diverging terms. Indeed, the speed of divergence of each kth inner and outer solutions having prefactor ε^k can be controlled once we can make the divergent speed of the powers of time derivatives of $w^\varepsilon(t)$ slower than ε^{-k}. This is one of the key points in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we first give a heuristic derivation of the evolutional law (1.4) of γ_t, as a result of the combination of (2.4) and (2.30). Then, we introduce the asymptotic expansion of the solution u^ε of the equation (1.1) in ε in details. It turns out that one needs to analyze the asymptotic expansion up to the Kth order term with $K > \max(n + 2, 6)$; cf. Lemma 2 of [3] and Theorem 4.9 below. In Section 3, we define an approximate solution and show the estimates on each term in the asymptotic expansion. This is accomplished by carefully studying the Schauder estimate for a diffusion operator with diverging coefficients. Then in Section 4, we give the proof of Theorem 1.1. In Section 5, we discuss the stochastic partial differential equation (SPDE) corresponding to (1.4) under the situation that $n = 2$ and the interfaces stay convex and show that the SPDE corresponding to (1.4) has a unique local solution in such case. Assumption 1.2 in law sense and Assumption 3.1 are shown in this situation.

Remark 1.1. *Weber [21] established the sharp interface limit for the stochastic Allen-Cahn equation in a.s.-sense with the choice of $\dot{w}^\varepsilon(t)$ such as the first example given in Section 4.1. In his argument, it was essential that the SPDE describing the dynamics of the limit hypersurface γ_t in terms of the signed distance d has an additive noise. This is*

not the case for our limit dynamics (1.4)*, so that his argument doesn't work for showing Assumption 1.2 under a more general setting than we discuss in Section 5.*

2 Asymptotic expansion of the solution of (1.1)

2.1 Heuristic argument for the derivation of (1.4)

Before starting the proof of Theorem 1.1, it might be worthy to give a heuristic derivation of the evolutional law (1.4) of the limit hypersurface γ_t from the stochastically perturbed mass-conserving Allen-Cahn equation (1.1).

Note that the scaling for the noise term in (1.1) is essentially different from that for the stochastic Allen-Cahn equation. In fact, without the term $-\fint_D f(u^\varepsilon)$ in (1.1), the proper scaling for the noise term was $\varepsilon^{-1}\alpha\dot{w}^\varepsilon(t)$ rather than $\alpha\dot{w}^\varepsilon(t)$, see [10]. We give a heuristic argument to explain the reason for this difference. In particular, we will see that the averaged reaction term behaves as $\fint_D f(u^\varepsilon) = O(\varepsilon)$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ so that $\varepsilon^{-2}\fint_D f(u^\varepsilon) \approx \varepsilon^{-1}\lambda_0(t)$ with a certain $\lambda_0(t)$, and the evolution of $\lambda_0(t)$ is governed by the noise $\alpha\dot{w}^\varepsilon(t)$ of $O(1)$.

Our basic ansatz is that $u^\varepsilon(t,x) \approx \pm 1$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$. We actually assume this at $t = 0$ as in (1.12). This implies $f(u^\varepsilon) \approx 0$ so that $a^\varepsilon(t) := \fint_D f(u^\varepsilon)$ should be small; see Remark 2.1 below. Conversely, if $a^\varepsilon(t)$ is small, the main term of the reaction term becomes $\varepsilon^{-2}f(u^\varepsilon)$ so that the solution u^ε is pushed toward ± 1 and we can expect our ansatz should be true. Anyway, this observation suggests that, instead of m defined by (1.2), it might be better to consider the perturbed traveling wave solutions with the reaction term f replaced by $f - a^\varepsilon(t) + \varepsilon^2 v(t)$ and $v(t) = \alpha\dot{w}^\varepsilon(t)$. We denote $v(t)$ for $\alpha\dot{w}^\varepsilon(t)$, since this term could be regarded as $O(1)$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$; see (2.5) below. More precisely, for $a \in \mathbb{R}$ with small $|a|$, define the traveling wave solution $m = m(\rho; a), \rho \in \mathbb{R}$ and its speed $c = c(a)$ by

$$\begin{cases} m'' + cm' + \{f(m) - a\} = 0, \quad \rho \in \mathbb{R}, \\ m(\pm\infty) = m_\pm^*, \quad m(0) = 0, \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

where $m_\pm^* \equiv m_\pm^*(a) = \pm 1 + O(a)\,(a \to 0)$ are solutions of $f(m_\pm^*) - a = 0$. It is easy to see that $c_0 := c'(0) = 2/\int_{\mathbb{R}} m'(\rho)^2 d\rho$, see below. Another expression of c_0 is also known: $c_0 = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\int_{-1}^1 \sqrt{V(u)}du}$ where $V(u) = \int_u^1 f(v)dv$, see [10].

Our guess for the behavior of the solution u^ε of (1.1) is the following:

$$u^\varepsilon(t,x) = m\Big(\frac{d(t,x)}{\varepsilon}; a^\varepsilon(t) - \varepsilon^2 v(t)\Big) + O(\varepsilon), \tag{2.2}$$

as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, where $d(t,x)$ is the signed distance between $x \in D$ and the limit hypersurface γ_t. Then, denoting $m(\cdot; a^\varepsilon(t) - \varepsilon^2 v(t))$ simply by m, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_D \Big\{\Delta u^\varepsilon + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\big(f(u^\varepsilon) - \fint_D f(u^\varepsilon)\big)\Big\}dx \\ &\approx \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\int_D \Big\{m''(\tfrac{d}{\varepsilon}) + \varepsilon m'(\tfrac{d}{\varepsilon})\Delta d + f\Big(m(\tfrac{d}{\varepsilon})\Big) - a^\varepsilon(t) + \varepsilon^2 v(t)\Big\}dx - |D|v(t) \end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\int_D \Big\{ -c\big(a^\varepsilon(t)-\varepsilon^2 v(t)\big)m'(\tfrac{d}{\varepsilon}) + \varepsilon m'(\tfrac{d}{\varepsilon})\Delta d\Big\}dx - |D|v(t)\\
&\approx \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\int_D m'(\tfrac{d}{\varepsilon})\{-c_0 a^\varepsilon(t)+\varepsilon\Delta d\}dx - |D|v(t)\\
&\approx \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\int_{\gamma_t} m'(\tfrac{r}{\varepsilon})\{-c_0 a^\varepsilon(t)+\varepsilon\kappa(t,\bar s)+\varepsilon r b(t,\bar s)\}dr d\bar s - |D|v(t)\\
&\approx \int_{\mathbb{R}}\int_{\gamma_t} m'(\rho)\Big\{-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}c_0 a^\varepsilon(t)+\kappa(t,\bar s)+\varepsilon\rho b(t,\bar s)\Big\}d\rho d\bar s - |D|v(t)\\
&= (m_+^*-m_-^*)\int_{\gamma_t}\Big\{-c_0\frac{a^\varepsilon(t)}{\varepsilon}+\kappa(t,\bar s)\Big\}d\bar s - |D|v(t)+O(\varepsilon).
\end{aligned}
$$

Here, the first line is a consequence of $\int_D \Delta u^\varepsilon dx = 0$ which holds under the Neumann condition at ∂D, we apply (2.2) for the second line recalling (2.22) below for Δu^ε, the third line follows from (2.1) with $a = a^\varepsilon(t)-\varepsilon^2 v(t)$, the fourth line by $c(a^\varepsilon-\varepsilon^2 v) = c_0 a^\varepsilon + O((a^\varepsilon)^2)+O(\varepsilon^2)$ and $c(0)=0$, the fifth line from (30), (40) of [3], that is, $\Delta d = \kappa(t,\bar s)+rb(t,\bar s)+O(\varepsilon)$ with $b(t,\bar s) = -\nabla d\cdot\nabla\Delta d$ for $\bar s\in\gamma_t$ denoting the volume element of γ_t by $d\bar s$, and the sixth line follows by the change of variables $r=\varepsilon\rho$. The above computation implies that $a^\varepsilon(t)$ should be of order $O(\varepsilon)$ and, defining $\lambda_0(t)$ as

$$
\frac{1}{\varepsilon}a^\varepsilon(t) \equiv \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\fint_D f(u^\varepsilon(t,\cdot)) = \lambda_0(t)+O(\varepsilon), \tag{2.3}
$$

since $m_\pm^* = \pm 1 + O(a^\varepsilon(t)-\varepsilon^2 v(t)) = \pm 1 + O(\varepsilon)$, we obtain

$$
2c_0\lambda_0(t)|\gamma_t| = 2\int_{\gamma_t}\kappa d\bar s - |D|v(t), \tag{2.4}
$$

in the limit $\varepsilon\downarrow 0$.

It will be clear that this condition is necessary for the first term of (3.13) to vanish and used in (2.29) to determine $\lambda_0(t)$; note that $c_0 = \bar\sigma := 2(\int_{\mathbb{R}} m'(\rho)^2 d\rho)^{-1}$ holds as we will see below, where $\bar\sigma$ is called the inverse surface tension. In particular, (2.2) and (2.3) suggest

$$
u^\varepsilon(t,x) \underset{x=(\bar s,r),r\to\pm\infty}{\sim} m_\pm^*(a^\varepsilon(t)-\varepsilon^2 v(t)) \sim \pm 1 + \varepsilon\frac{\lambda_0(t)}{f'(\pm 1)},
$$

since $0 = f(m_\pm^*)-a \sim f'(\pm1)(m_\pm^*\mp 1)-a$, which implies $m_\pm^*\sim\pm1+\frac{a}{f'(\pm1)}$. This exactly coincides with the formula (2.34) for the asymptotic behavior of the outer solutions.

Once (2.4) is obtained, (1.4) could be derived from

$$
V = \kappa - \bar\sigma\lambda_0(t) \quad \text{ on } \gamma_t,
$$

which is obtained as a solvability condition for u_0 appearing in the expansion of u^ε, see (2.30) below. Later, we will consider the expansion of u^ε based on $m(\frac{d(t,x)}{\varepsilon};0)$ with $a=0$ rather than that introduced in (2.2), since the leading orders are same.

We finally comment on the identity $c_0=\bar\sigma$. The smoothness of $c(a)$ in a is shown in the Appendix of [6]. We compute for $m = m(\cdot;a)$ as

$$
0 = -\int_{\mathbb{R}}\frac{1}{2}\Big\{(m')^2\Big\}'d\rho = -\int_{\mathbb{R}} m''\cdot m' d\rho
$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \{c(a)m' + f(m) - a\}m' d\rho$$
$$= c(a) \int_{\mathbb{R}} (m')^2 d\rho + \int_{m_-^*}^{m_+^*} f(s)ds - a(m_+^* - m_-^*).$$

Take the derivative of both sides in a and set $a = 0$ noting that $m' = m'(\rho; a)$ and $m_\pm^* = m_\pm^*(a)$. This leads to the identity $c_0 = \bar{\sigma}$ since $m_\pm^*(a) = \pm 1 + O(a)$ as $a \to 0$.

Remark 2.1. *If the condition* (1.12) *does not hold for the initial data g^ε, $a^\varepsilon(0)$ is not small in general. In this case, $a^\varepsilon(t)$ may not be small as well. This means that the reaction term $f(u) - a^\varepsilon(t)$ does not satisfy the balance condition, i.e., the last equality in the condition* (i) *for f. Thus, the situation is more close to that Gärtner [13] and others discussed at least in the non-random case; see Section 4.1 of [12] and also Hilhorst et. al. [15]. In particular, the proper time scale and the limit dynamics should be totally different from ours.*

2.2 Signed distance from γ_t and parametrization of γ_t

Let us start more precise discussions. The expansion of the solution $u^\varepsilon(t, x)$ of (1.1) in ε will be given only in ε appearing in the reaction term and not that in the noise term. To make this clear, we consider the following equation with an external force $v(t)$, which is deterministic (non-random) such that $v \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+)$:

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial u^\varepsilon}{\partial t} = \Delta u^\varepsilon + \varepsilon^{-2}\left(f(u^\varepsilon) - \fint_D f(u^\varepsilon)\right) + v(t), & \text{in } D \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\ \dfrac{\partial u^\varepsilon}{\partial \nu} = 0, & \text{on } \partial D \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\ u^\varepsilon(\cdot, 0) = g^\varepsilon(\cdot), & \text{in } D. \end{cases} \tag{2.5}$$

Nevertheless to say, the solution of (1.1) is the same as that of (2.5) with $v = \alpha \dot{w}^\varepsilon$. In addition, we consider the hypersurface $\{\gamma_t^v\}$ whose evolution is governed by

$$V^v = \kappa - \fint_{\gamma_t^v} \kappa + \frac{|D|}{2|\gamma_t^v|} v(t), \tag{2.6}$$

where V^v is the inward normal velocity of γ_t^v. Suppose that (2.6) has a unique solution for $t \le T^v$ with some $T^v > 0$. Under these settings, we will first expand the solution $u^\varepsilon = u^{\varepsilon,v}$ of (2.5) in ε based on the solution $\gamma_t = \gamma_t^v$ of (2.6). Next, we will estimate each term appearing in the expansion by a suitable norm of v; see Proposition 3.6 and Lemma 4.3. Finally, in Sections 4.2–4.5, we will apply these lemmas taking $v(t) = \alpha \dot{w}^\varepsilon(t)$.

Let $d = d^v(t, x)$ be the signed distance of $x \in D$ to the hypersurface γ_t, which is negative inside γ_t; cf. Bellettini [1], Chapter 1. To parametrize the hypersurface γ_t on a fixed reference manifold, we go along with [1], Chapter 16 as follows. Let $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an oriented compact $(n-1)$-dimensional submanifold without boundary and with finitely many connected components being smoothly embedded in $\mathbb{R}^n$. For each $s = (s^l)_{l=1}^n \in \mathcal{S}$, except some singular points, s^n is represented by other coordinates such that $s^n = s^n(s^1, \dots, s^{n-1})$ and thus we can take $s = (s^l)_{l=1}^{n-1}$ as a local coordinate of $\mathcal{S}$.

Near singular points for s^n, one may take other coordinates, e.g., $(s^l)_{l=2}^n$, but we denote it by $s = (s^l)_{l=1}^{n-1}$ for simplicity. Then, $\left\{\frac{\partial}{\partial s^l}\right\}_{l=1}^{n-1}$ forms a basis of the tangent space $T_s\mathcal{S}$ at $s \in \mathcal{S}$. We parametrize $\gamma_t, t \in [0,T]$ as $x = X_0(t,s)$ by $s = (s^l)_{l=1}^{n-1} \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $X_0 \in C^\infty([0,T] \times \mathcal{S}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ and the map $X_0(t,\cdot) : \mathcal{S} \to \gamma_t$ is homeomorphic for every $t \in [0,T]$. In particular, $(\frac{\partial X_0(t,s)}{\partial s^1}, \dots, \frac{\partial X_0(t,s)}{\partial s^{n-1}})$ forms a basis of the tangent space to γ_t at $x = X_0(t,s)$ for each $s \in \mathcal{S}$.

We denote by $\mathbf{n}(t,s)$ the unit outer normal vector on γ_t so that

$$\mathbf{n}(t,s) = \nabla d(t, X_0(t,s)). \tag{2.7}$$

We define the Jacobian of the map $X_0(t,\cdot)$ as

$$J^0(t,s) = \det\big[\mathbf{n}(t,s), \partial_{s^1} X_0(t,s), \dots, \partial_{s^{n-1}} X_0(t,s)\big]. \tag{2.8}$$

Remark 2.2. *Bellettini [1], p. 251 introduces the parametrization $\varphi_\varepsilon(t,s)$ of the hypersurface $\tilde{\gamma}_t^\varepsilon$ determined by (2.18) below. Our parametrization $X_0(t,s)$ of γ_t by $\mathcal{S}$ is similar and corresponds to $\varphi_0(t,s)$ in [1]. Chen et al. [3], (31) considers the parametrization by U instead of our $\mathcal{S}$ satisfying*

$$J^0(t,s) = 1, \tag{2.9}$$

but under this parametrization the set U changes in t. To avoid this inconvenience, we follow [1].

Let $\delta > 0$ be small enough such that the signed distance function $d(t,x)$ from γ_t is smooth in the 3δ-neighborhood of γ_t and the distance between γ_t and ∂D is larger than 3δ for every $t \in [0,T^v]$. A local coordinate $(r,s) \in (-3\delta, 3\delta) \times \mathcal{S}$ of x in a tubular neighborhood of γ_t is defined by

$$x = X_0(t,s) + r\mathbf{n}(t,s) =: X(t,r,s). \tag{2.10}$$

Then its inverse function is given by

$$r = d(t,x), \quad s = \mathbf{S}(t,x) = (S^1(t,x), \dots, S^{n-1}(t,x)).$$

In particular, since $r = d(t, X_0(t,s) + r\mathbf{n}(t,s))$, by differentiating this in r, we have

$$\nabla d(t, X_0(t,s) + r\mathbf{n}(t,s)) \cdot \mathbf{n}(t,s) = 1, \quad r \in (-3\delta, 3\delta).$$

Since $|\nabla d(t,x)| = 1$ for x close to γ_t, this implies

$$\nabla d(t, X_0(t,s) + r\mathbf{n}(t,s)) = \mathbf{n}(t,s), \quad r \in (-3\delta, 3\delta). \tag{2.11}$$

Changing coordinates from (t,x) to (t,r,s) for a function $\phi = \phi(t,x)$, we associate another function $\tilde{\phi} = \tilde{\phi}(t,r,s)$ as

$$\tilde{\phi}(t,r,s) = \phi(t, X_0(t,s) + r\mathbf{n}(t,s)),$$

or equivalently

$$\phi(t,x) = \tilde{\phi}(t, d(t,x), \mathbf{S}(t,x)).$$

Let $V(t,s)$ be the inward normal velocity of the interface γ_t at $X_0(t,s)$,

$$V(t,s) = -\partial_t X_0(t,s) \cdot \mathbf{n}(t,s).$$

From (2.7) and $d(t, X_0(t,s)) = 0$, we see that

$$V(t,s) = \partial_t d(t, X_0(t,s)). \tag{2.12}$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t \phi(t,x) &= (V\partial_r + \partial_t^\Gamma)\tilde{\phi}(t, d(t,x), \mathbf{S}(t,x)),\\
\nabla\phi(t,x) &= (\mathbf{n}(t, \mathbf{S}(t,x))\partial_r + \nabla^\Gamma)\tilde{\phi}(t, d(t,x), \mathbf{S}(t,x)),\\
\Delta\phi(t,x) &= (\partial_r^2 + \Delta d(t,x)\partial_r + \Delta^\Gamma)\tilde{\phi}(t, d(t,x), \mathbf{S}(t,x)),
\end{aligned}$$

where the superscripts Γ mean the derivatives tangential to the hypersurface γ^v seen under the coordinate $s \in \mathcal{S}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t^\Gamma \tilde{\phi} &= (\partial_t + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} S_t^i \partial_{s^i})\tilde{\phi},\\
\nabla^\Gamma \tilde{\phi} &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \partial_1 S^i \partial_{s^i}, \dots, \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \partial_n S^i \partial_{s^i} \right) \tilde{\phi},\\
\Delta^\Gamma \tilde{\phi} &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \Delta S^i \partial_{s^i} + \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} \nabla S^i \cdot \nabla S^j \partial^2_{s^i s^j} \right) \tilde{\phi},
\end{aligned}$$

see (33) in [3] recalling that the sign of V is opposite. We denote by $\kappa_1, \cdots, \kappa_{n-1}, 0$ the eigenvalues of the Hessian $D_x^2 d(t,x)$ with corresponding normalized eigenvectors $\tau_1, \cdots, \tau_{n-1}$, ∇d. Set

$$\kappa(t,s) := (n-1)\bar{\kappa}_{\gamma_t} = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \kappa_i = \Delta d(t, X_0(t,s)), \tag{2.13}$$

where $\bar{\kappa}_{\gamma_t}$ is the mean curvature of γ_t at $x = X_0(t,s)$. We denote

$$b(t,s) := -\nabla d \cdot \nabla \Delta d(t,x)|_{x=X_0(t,s)} = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \kappa_i^2. \tag{2.14}$$

2.3 Formal expansion of the solution u^ε

In this subsection, we briefly recall in our setting the method of construction of inner and outer solutions given in [3]. The equation (2.5) is expressed as

$$0 = f(u^\varepsilon(t,x)) + \varepsilon^2(-\partial_t u^\varepsilon(t,x) + \Delta u^\varepsilon(t,x) + v(t)) - \varepsilon\lambda_\varepsilon(t), \tag{2.15}$$

where $\lambda_\varepsilon(t) := \varepsilon^{-1} a^\varepsilon(t)$ is given in (2.3), that is,

$$\lambda_\varepsilon(t) := \varepsilon^{-1} \fint_D f(u^\varepsilon(t,\cdot)). \tag{2.16}$$

Note that (2.15) combined with the conservation law

$$\partial_t \int_D u^\varepsilon(t,x)dx = |D| v(t) \tag{2.17}$$

implies (2.16) and therefore (2.5). We define $h_\varepsilon(t,s)$ by

$$\tilde{\gamma}_t^\varepsilon \equiv \{x \in D \,|\, u^\varepsilon(t,x) = 0\} = \{X(t,r,s) \,|\, r = \varepsilon h_\varepsilon(t,s), s \in \mathcal{S}\}, \tag{2.18}$$

which is the 0-level set of the solution u^ε of (2.5). We will expand u^ε, λ_ε and h_ε in ε, see (2.24) and (2.25) below.

Let us define the stretched variable $\rho = \rho^\varepsilon(t,x)$ as

$$\rho^\varepsilon(t,x) = \frac{d(t,x) - \varepsilon h_\varepsilon(t, \mathbf{S}(t,x))}{\varepsilon},$$

which is the distance between x and $\tilde{\gamma}_t^\varepsilon$ divided by $\varepsilon > 0$. Then, the variables (t,x) and (t,ρ,s) are related by

$$x = \hat{X}(t,\rho,s) = X(t, \varepsilon(\rho + h_\varepsilon(t,s)), s) = X_0(t,s) + \varepsilon(\rho + h_\varepsilon(t,s))\mathbf{n}(t,s). \tag{2.19}$$

Furthermore, its Jacobian $J^\varepsilon(t,\rho,s)$ defined by $dx = \varepsilon J^\varepsilon(t,\rho,s) d\rho ds$ is written as

$$J^\varepsilon(t,\rho,s) = J^0(t,s)\left(1 + \Delta d(t,s)(\varepsilon(\rho + h_\varepsilon(t,s))) + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} (\varepsilon(\rho + h_\varepsilon(t,s)))^i j_i(t,s)\right), \tag{2.20}$$

with some given functions j_i depending on γ_t; see [3], (44) p. 537 and also p. 538. By the change of variable formula (see [3], (39)), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t u^\varepsilon(t,x) =& \big(V(t,\mathbf{S}(t,x))\varepsilon^{-1} - \partial_t^\Gamma h_\varepsilon(t,\mathbf{S}(t,x))\big)\partial_\rho \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t,\rho(t,x),\mathbf{S}(t,x)) \\ &+ \partial_t^\Gamma \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t,\rho(t,x),\mathbf{S}(t,x)), \end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta u^\varepsilon(t,x) =& \left(\varepsilon^{-2} + |\nabla^\Gamma h_\varepsilon(t,\mathbf{S}(t,x))|^2\right)\partial_\rho^2 \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t,\rho(t,x),\mathbf{S}(t,x)) \\ &+ \left(\Delta d(t,x)\varepsilon^{-1} - \Delta^\Gamma h_\varepsilon(t,\mathbf{S}(t,x))\right)\partial_\rho \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t,\rho(t,x),\mathbf{S}(t,x)) \\ &- 2\nabla^\Gamma h_\varepsilon(t,\mathbf{S}(t,x)) \cdot \nabla^\Gamma \partial_\rho \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t,\rho(t,x),\mathbf{S}(t,x)) \\ &+ \Delta^\Gamma \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t,\rho(t,x),\mathbf{S}(t,x)), \end{aligned} \tag{2.22}$$

where $\tilde{u}^\varepsilon = \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t,\rho,s)$ is the function $u^\varepsilon = u^\varepsilon(t,x)$ viewed under the coordinate (t,ρ,s) defined by (2.19). In the following, we will denote $\tilde{u}^\varepsilon$ by u for simplicity. Therefore, from (2.15), we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 =& \big[\partial_\rho^2 u + f(u)\big] + \varepsilon\big[(-V(t,s) + \Delta d)\partial_\rho u - \lambda_\varepsilon(t)\big] \\ &+ \varepsilon^2\big[(\Delta^\Gamma u - \partial_t^\Gamma u) + (\partial_t^\Gamma h_\varepsilon - \Delta^\Gamma h_\varepsilon)\partial_\rho u\big] \\ &+ \varepsilon^2\big[|\nabla^\Gamma h_\varepsilon|^2 \partial_\rho^2 u - 2\nabla^\Gamma h_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla^\Gamma \partial_\rho u\big] + \varepsilon^2 v(t). \end{aligned} \tag{2.23}$$

Suppose that u and h_ε have the *inner* asymptotic expansions:

$$\begin{aligned} u(t,\rho,s) &= m(\rho) + \varepsilon u_0(t,\rho,s) + \varepsilon^2 u_1(t,\rho,s) + \varepsilon^3 u_2(t,\rho,s) + \cdots, \\ \varepsilon h_\varepsilon(t,s) &= \varepsilon h_1(t,s) + \varepsilon^2 h_2(t,s) + \varepsilon^3 h_3(t,s) + \cdots, \end{aligned} \tag{2.24}$$

for $(t,\rho,s) \in [0,T^v]\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathcal{S}$, respectively, where m is the standing wave solution determined by (1.2). On the other hand, assume that λ_ε and $u^\pm$ have the *outer* asymptotic expansions:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_\varepsilon(t) &= \lambda_0(t) + \varepsilon\lambda_1(t) + \varepsilon^2\lambda_2(t) + \varepsilon^3\lambda_3(t) + \cdots, \\ u^\pm(t) &= \pm 1 + \varepsilon u_0^\pm(t) + \varepsilon^2 u_1^\pm(t) + \varepsilon^3 u_2^\pm(t) + \cdots, \end{aligned} \tag{2.25}$$

for $t \in [0,T^v]$, respectively. Furthermore, let us note that $\Delta d(t,x)$ is expanded into

$$\begin{aligned} &\Delta d(t,x)|_{x=X_0(t,s)+\varepsilon(\rho+h_\varepsilon(t,s))\mathbf{n}(t,s)} \\ =&\kappa(t,s) - \varepsilon(\rho+h_\varepsilon(t,s))b(t,s) + \sum_{i\geq 2}\varepsilon^i b_i(t,s)(\rho+h_\varepsilon(t,s))^i, \end{aligned} \tag{2.26}$$

where $b_i(t,s)$, $i \geq 2$ are some functions depending only on γ_t; see (40) of [3].

2.4 Inductive scheme to determine coefficients

In this subsection, for a fixed $K > \max(n+2, 6)$, we construct functions $\{u_k\}_{k=0}^K$, $\{h_k\}_{k=0}^K$, $\{\lambda_k\}_{k=0}^K$ and $\{u_k^\pm\}_{k=0}^K$ appearing in the above expansions (2.24) and (2.25) of u, h_ε, λ_ε and $u^\pm$ defined for $t \in [0,T^v]$ in such a manner that all k-th order terms (that is, those of order $O(\varepsilon^k)$) vanish when we substitute these formal expansions in (2.23), where we set $h_0 = 0$ for convenience. In fact, setting

$$\nu_k = (u_k, h_k, \lambda_k, u_k^\pm), \quad k = 0,1,\ldots,K, \tag{2.27}$$

ν_k will be inductively determined as follows: For $k=0$, λ_0 will be defined by (2.29) below, u_0 by (2.32) and $u_0^\pm$ by (2.34), respectively. This determines ν_0. For $k \geq 1$, once we know $\{\nu_i\}_{i=0}^{k-1}$, h_k is determined by solving the equation (2.44) and λ_k by (2.43) knowing h_k additionally, respectively. Furthermore, u_k is defined by (2.38) knowing h_k and λ_k, while $u_k^\pm$ are determined by (2.41).

When we insert the expansion of u in (2.24) into (2.23), the term of order $O(1)$ needs to satisfy $m''(\rho) + f(m(\rho)) = 0$ so that we took the leading term of u as $m(\rho)$.

Let us start the procedure to determine ν_0. For the term of order $O(\varepsilon)$ in (2.23) to vanish, recalling (2.26), we have

$$\mathcal{L}u_0 = (-V+\kappa)m' - \lambda_0(t), \tag{2.28}$$

where $\mathcal{L}$ is the linearized operator of $-(\partial_\rho^2 u + f(u))$ around m defined as

$$\mathcal{L}u_0 = -\partial_\rho^2 u_0 - f'(m)u_0, \quad \rho \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Suggested by (2.4), we first define $\lambda_0(t)$ as

$$\lambda_0(t) = \frac{1}{\bar{\sigma}|\gamma_t^v|}\int_{\gamma_t^v}\kappa(t,\bar{s})d\bar{s} - \frac{|D|}{2\bar{\sigma}|\gamma_t^v|}v(t). \tag{2.29}$$

Note that $\int_{\gamma_t^v}\kappa(t,\bar{s})d\bar{s}=\int_{\mathcal{S}}\kappa(t,s)J^0(t,s)ds$ and $|\gamma_t^v|=\int_{\mathcal{S}}J^0(t,s)ds$ by the change of variables $\bar{s}=X_0(t,s)$. Then, from the solvability condition $\int\mathcal{L}u_0\,m'd\rho=0$ for (2.28), V needs to satisfy

$$-V(t,s)+\kappa(t,s)=\lambda_0(t)\bar{\sigma},\quad (t,s)\in[0,T^v]\times\mathcal{S}, \tag{2.30}$$

where $\bar{\sigma}=2(\int_{\mathbb{R}}m'(\rho)^2d\rho)^{-1}$. This combined with (2.29) leads to the evolutional law (2.6) of γ_t^v.

Next, to determine u_0, we note the following fact: Since $m_1(\rho)=m'(\rho)$ and $m_2(\rho)=m'(\rho)\int_0^\rho\frac{1}{m'(y)^2}dy$ are linearly independent two solutions of $\mathcal{L}u(\rho)=0$ and $m_1'm_2-m_1m_2'=-1$, the solution of the equation $\mathcal{L}u(\rho)=g(\rho)$ satisfying $u(0)=0$ is unique and given by

$$\begin{aligned}u(\rho)=&\Big(-\int_0^\rho m'(y)g(y)dy\Big)m'(\rho)\int_0^\rho\frac{dy}{m'(y)^2}\\&+\Big(\int_0^\rho m'(y)(\int_0^y\frac{dz}{m'(z)^2})g(y)dy\Big)m'(\rho).\end{aligned} \tag{2.31}$$

Let us determine $u_0(t,\rho,s)$ and $u_0^\pm(t)$. The function $u_0(t,\rho,s)$ satisfies (2.28). To solve this equation, let θ_1 be a unique solution of $\mathcal{L}\theta_1=1-m'\bar{\sigma}$, namely, from (2.31) with $g=1-m'\bar{\sigma}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_1(\rho)=&\Big(-\int_0^\rho m'(y)(1-m'(y)\bar{\sigma})dy\Big)m'(\rho)\int_0^\rho\frac{1}{m'(y)^2}dy\\&+\Big(\int_0^\rho m'(y)(\int_0^y\frac{1}{m'(z)^2}dz)(1-m'(y)\bar{\sigma})dy\Big)m'(\rho).\end{aligned}$$

Then, noting (2.30), $u_0(t,\rho,s)$ is given by

$$u_0(t,\rho,s)=-\lambda_0(t)\theta_1(\rho). \tag{2.32}$$

Furthermore, since $\lim_{\rho\to\pm\infty}|g(t,\rho,s)+\lambda_0(t)|=O(e^{-\zeta|\rho|})$, $\zeta>0$ holds for the right hand side $g(t,\rho,s)$ of (2.28), by Lemma 3 in [3], it follows that

$$\lim_{\rho\to\pm\infty}\partial_\rho^m\partial_s^{\mathbf{n}}\partial_t^l\Big(u_0(t,\rho,s)-\frac{\lambda_0(t)}{f'(\pm1)}\Big)=O(e^{-\zeta|\rho|}), \tag{2.33}$$

for all $(m,\mathbf{n},l)\in\mathbb{Z}_+\times\mathbb{Z}_+^{n-1}\times\mathbb{Z}_+$. Therefore, we define

$$u_0^\pm(t):=\frac{\lambda_0(t)}{f'(\pm1)}. \tag{2.34}$$

Now, let us determine ν_k for $k\geq1$ assuming that $\{\nu_i\}_{i=0}^{k-1}$ are known. For the term of order $O(\varepsilon^{k+1})$ in (2.23) to vanish, it is necessary to have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}u_k=&A^{k-1}+\big(\partial_t^\Gamma-\Delta^\Gamma-b(t,s)\big)h_k\,m'-b(t,s)\rho\,m'1_{\{k=1\}}\\&+(2\cdot1_{\{k\geq2\}}+1_{\{k=1\}})\nabla^\Gamma h_1\cdot\nabla^\Gamma h_k\,m''-\lambda_k(t)+v(t)1_{\{k=1\}},\end{aligned} \tag{2.35}$$

where $b(t,s)$ is defined by (2.14), $A^{k-1}=A^{k-1}(\lambda_0,u_i,h_i,0\leq i\leq k-1)$ is given by

$$A^{k-1}=\lambda_0(t)\bar{\sigma}\,\partial_\rho u_{k-1} \tag{2.36}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\sum_{l=2}^{k} b_l(t,s) \sum_{\substack{i_1,\cdots,i_l\geq 1, j\geq -1,\\ i_1+\cdots+i_l+j=k-1}} \tilde{h}_{i_1}\cdots\tilde{h}_{i_l}\,\partial_\rho u_j - \partial_t^\Gamma u_{k-2} + \Delta^\Gamma u_{k-2}\\
&+\sum_{i=1}^{k-1}\big(\partial_t^\Gamma h_i - \Delta^\Gamma h_i - b(t,s)\tilde{h}_i\big)\partial_\rho u_{k-1-i}\\
&+\sum_{\substack{i,j\geq 1, i+j\leq k+1,\\ (i,j)\neq(k,1),(1,k)}} \nabla^\Gamma h_i\cdot\nabla^\Gamma h_j \partial_\rho^2 u_{k-(i+j)} - 2\sum_{i=1}^{k-1}\nabla^\Gamma h_i\cdot\nabla^\Gamma\partial_\rho u_{k-1-i}\\
&+\sum_{l=2}^{k+1}\frac{1}{l!}f^{(l)}(m)\sum_{\substack{i_1,\ldots,i_l\geq 0,\\ i_1+\cdots+i_l=k+1-l}} u_{i_1}\cdots u_{i_l},
\end{aligned}
$$

$\tilde{h}_i(t,s) := h_i(t,s) + \rho\,1_{\{i=1\}}$, $1\leq i\leq K$, $u_{-1}=m$ and $b_l(t,s)$ are defined by (2.26). In particular, $A^0(\lambda_0,u_0) = \lambda_0(t)\bar{\sigma}\,\partial_\rho u_0 + \frac{1}{2}f''(m)u_0^2$, since $\partial_t^\Gamma m = \Delta^\Gamma m = 0$. We have used (2.26) and (2.30) to have the expansion of the term $-V+\Delta d$.

From the solvability condition $\int \mathcal{L}u_k\, m'd\rho = 0$ for (2.35) and noting that $\int_{\mathbb{R}} m''m'\,d\rho = 0$, it follows that λ_k and h_k should satisfy

$$
\begin{aligned}
\lambda_k(t) =& \frac{1}{\bar{\sigma}}\left(\partial_t^\Gamma - \Delta^\Gamma - b(t,s)\right)h_k + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}} A^{k-1}m'(\rho)d\rho\\
&+\left\{v(t) - \frac{1}{2}b(t,s)\int_{\mathbb{R}}\rho\left(m'(\rho)\right)^2\,d\rho\right\}1_{\{k=1\}}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.37}
$$

The next task is to determine $u_k(t,\rho,s)$ and $u_k^\pm(t)$. Recall that $k\geq 1$ is fixed. From (2.31), it follows that the linear equation $\mathcal{L}u_k = \widetilde{A}^k$ satisfying $u(t,0,s)=0$ has a unique solution given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
u_k(t,\rho,s) =& \Big(-\int_0^\rho m'(y)\widetilde{A}^k(t,y,s)dy\Big)m'(\rho)\int_0^\rho\frac{dy}{m'(y)^2}\\
&+\Big(\int_0^\rho m'(y)\Big(\int_0^y\frac{dz}{m'(z)^2}\Big)\widetilde{A}^k(t,y,s)dy\Big)m'(\rho),
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.38}
$$

where $\widetilde{A}^k(t,\rho,s)$ denotes the right hand side of (2.35). Especially, supposing that $u_0^\pm$, $u_1^\pm,\ldots,u_{k-1}^\pm$ are determined inductively and $\{u_i\}_{i=0}^{k-1}$ satisfy the following (2.39) with i instead of k, from Lemma 3 in [3] and noting that h_k are independent of ρ and m', $\rho m'$, m'', $\partial_\rho u_i$, $\partial_\rho^2 u_i$, $\Delta^\Gamma u_{k-2}$ tend to 0 as $|\rho|\to\infty$, it is easy to check

$$
\partial_\rho^m\partial_s^{\mathbf{n}}\partial_t^l\Big(u_k(t,\rho,s) - \frac{g_k^\pm(t)}{f'(\pm 1)}\Big) = O(e^{-\zeta|\rho|}),\quad \text{as } \rho\to\pm\infty,
\tag{2.39}
$$

for (t,s), where

$$
\begin{aligned}
g_k^\pm(t) &= -\left(A^{k-1}|_{\rho=\pm\infty} - \lambda_k(t) + v(t)1_{\{k=1\}}\right)\\
&= -\sum_{j=2}^{k+1}\frac{1}{j!}\sum_{\substack{0\leq i_1\leq i_2\leq\cdots\leq i_j,\\ i_1+i_2+\cdots+i_j=k-(j-1)}} f^{(j)}(\pm 1)\frac{u_{i_1}^\pm(t)\cdots u_{i_j}^\pm(t)}{f'(\pm 1)^j}
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.40}
$$

$$+ \partial_t^\Gamma u_{k-2}^\pm(t) + \lambda_k(t) - v(t)1_{\{k=1\}}.$$

This suggests to define

$$u_k^\pm(t) := \frac{g_k^\pm(t)}{f'(\pm 1)}. \tag{2.41}$$

We will determine $\lambda_k(t)$ in such a way that the term of order $O(\varepsilon^k)$ of the integral

$$\int_D \Big(\partial_t u_k^\varepsilon(t,x) - v(t)\Big)dx \tag{2.42}$$

vanishes, where u_k^ε is an approximate solution defined as (3.2) later. In fact, this results in

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_k(t) = \frac{1}{\bar\sigma|\gamma_t^v|}\int_{\mathcal S}\Big(&(\Delta d(t,X_0(t,s)) - \bar\sigma\lambda_0(t))\Delta d(t,X_0(t,s))h_k(t,s) - b(t,s)h_k(t,s)\\ &+ \frac{\bar\sigma}{2}\int_{\mathbb R} A^{k-1}m'(\rho)d\rho\Big)J^0(t,s)ds\\ &+ \Big(v(t) - \frac{1}{2|\gamma_t^v|}\int_{\mathbb R}\rho(m'(\rho))^2d\rho\int_{\mathcal S} b(t,s)J^0(t,s)ds\Big)1_{\{k=1\}}\\ &+ \frac{1}{2\bar\sigma|\gamma_t^v|}B_{k-1},\end{aligned} \tag{2.43}$$

where $B_{k-1} = B_{k-1}(u_i, u_i^\pm, h_i,\ 0\le i\le k-1)$ is a term which is determined from u_i, $u_i^\pm$ and h_i, $0\le i\le k-1$; see Section 3.2, in particular, (3.11) for B_{k-1} and (3.14) below. From (2.37) and (2.43), we define h_k as the solution of the following equation:

$$\begin{aligned}&\big(\partial_t^\Gamma - \Delta^\Gamma - b(t,s)\big)\,h_k(t,s)\\ &\quad - \frac{1}{|\gamma_t^v|}\int_{\mathcal S}\Big(\big(\Delta d(t,X_0(t,s')) - \bar\sigma\lambda_0(t)\big)\Delta d(t,X_0(t,s')) - b(t,s')\Big)h_k(t,s')J^0(t,s')ds'\\ &= -\frac{\bar\sigma}{2}\int_{\mathbb R} A^{k-1}\,m'(\rho)d\rho + \frac{\bar\sigma}{2|\gamma_t^v|}\int\int_{\mathcal S\times\mathbb R} A^{k-1}\,m'(\rho)J^0(t,s')ds'd\rho\\ &\quad + \Big(\frac{\bar\sigma}{2}\big(b(t,s) - \frac{1}{|\gamma_t^v|}\int_{\mathcal S} b(t,s')J^0(t,s')ds'\big)\int_{\mathbb R}\rho(m'(\rho))^2d\rho\Big)1_{\{k=1\}} + \frac{1}{2|\gamma_t^v|}B_{k-1}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.44}$$

This is a linear equation for h_k, $k\ge 1$; note that the right hand side is determined from λ_0, u_i, $u_i^\pm$ and h_i with $0\le i\le k-1$. When $k=1$, nonlinear term $|\nabla^\Gamma h_1|^2$ appears in (2.35), however, this disappears by the relation $\int_{\mathbb R} m'(\rho)m''(\rho)d\rho = 0$. We will study the equation (2.44) in Section 3.3.3.

3 Approximate solutions and their estimates

3.1 Approximate solutions

Once all $\{\nu_i\}_{i=0}^K$ are determined, for $k = 0, 1, \cdots, K$, we can define *approximations* $u_{k,\varepsilon}^{\rm in}$, $u_{k,\varepsilon,\pm}^{\rm out}$, h_k^ε, λ_k^ε and $\rho_{k,\varepsilon}$ of u both in inner and outer's senses, h_ε, λ_ε and ρ_ε, respectively,

by cutting the expansions (2.24) and (2.25) after the $k+1$th or kth terms:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&u^{\mathrm{in}}_{k,\varepsilon}(t,x) := m(\rho) + \sum_{i=0}^{k} \varepsilon^{i+1} u_i(t,\rho,\mathbf{S}(t,x)),\\
&u^{\mathrm{out}}_{k,\varepsilon,\pm}(t) := \pm 1 + \sum_{i=0}^{k} \varepsilon^{i+1} u^{\pm}_i(t),\\
&\varepsilon h^{\varepsilon}_k(t,s) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \varepsilon^{i} h_i(t,s),\\
&\lambda^{\varepsilon}_k(t) := \sum_{i=0}^{k} \varepsilon^{i} \lambda_i(t),\\
&\rho = \rho_{k,\varepsilon}(t,x) := \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\big(d(t,x) - \varepsilon h^{\varepsilon}_k(t,\mathbf{S}(t,x))\big).
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.1}
$$

Let $\eta \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{R})$ be a function satisfying the conditions: $\eta(s) = 1$ for $|s| \le \delta$, $\eta(s) = 0$ for $|s| \ge 2\delta$ and $0 \le s\eta'(s) \le 4$ for $\delta \le |s| \le 2\delta$. Then, define the approximate solutions $u^{\varepsilon}_k(t,x)$ as follows by connecting the inner and outer approximate solutions:

$$
u^{\varepsilon}_k(t,x) := \eta(d(t,x))u^{in}_{k,\varepsilon}(t,x) + \big(1-\eta(d(t,x))\big)\big(u^{\mathrm{out}}_{k,\varepsilon,+}(t)1_{\{d>0\}} + u^{\mathrm{out}}_{k,\varepsilon,-}(t)1_{\{d<0\}}\big). \tag{3.2}
$$

3.2 Derivation of (2.43)

Now we consider the integral (2.42), which is the left hand side of (1.7) times $|D|$ with u^{ε} and $\alpha\dot{w}^{\varepsilon}$ replaced by u^{ε}_k and v, respectively, and expand it in ε to obtain (2.43). Let us decompose the time derivative of the mass of u^{ε}_k over D into

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_D \partial_t u^{\varepsilon}_k(t,x)dx &= \int_{|d(t,x)|\ge 3\delta} \partial_t u^{\varepsilon}_k(t,x)dx\\
&\quad + \int_{|\rho|\ge\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}} \partial_t u^{\varepsilon}_k(t,x)dx + \int_{|\rho|<\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}} \partial_t u^{\varepsilon}_k(t,x)dx\\
&= I + II + III,
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\delta > 0$ is chosen in Section 2.2, $\{|\rho| \ge \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}\} = \{x \in V^t_{3\delta} : |\rho(t,x)| \ge \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}\}$, $\{|\rho| < \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}\} = \{x \in V^t_{3\delta} : |\rho(t,x)| < \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}\}$ and $V^t_{3\delta} := \{x \in D : |d(t,x)| < 3\delta\}$. From now on, we choose a sufficiently small $\varepsilon^*_0 = \varepsilon^*_0(\delta, K, v) > 0$ such that

$$
\sup_{s\in\mathcal{S}, t\in[0,T]} |\varepsilon h^{\varepsilon}_k(t,s)| \le \frac{\delta}{2} \tag{3.3}
$$

holds for all $0 < \varepsilon \le \varepsilon^*_0$. This is possible for each v. Thus $|d(t,x)| \ge \frac{\delta}{2}$ follows from $|\rho(t,x)| \ge \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}$ and for any point (t,x) where either $|d(t,x)| \ge 3\delta$ or $|\rho(t,x)| \ge \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}$, $|d(t,x)| \ge \frac{\delta}{2}$ holds. Noting that each inner solution u_i converges to its associated outer solution $u^{\pm}_i$ with an error $O(e^{-\zeta|\rho|})$ as $|\rho| \to \infty$, and setting

$$
D^+_{\varepsilon}(t) = \big\{x \in D : d(t,x) \ge 3\delta\big\} \cup \big\{x \in D : |d(t,x)| < 3\delta,\ \rho(t,x) > 0\big\},
$$

$$D_\varepsilon^-(t) = D\backslash \bar{D}_\varepsilon^+(t),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} I + II =& (u_{k,\varepsilon,+}^{\mathrm{out}})'(t)|D_\varepsilon^+(t)| + (u_{k,\varepsilon,-}^{\mathrm{out}})'(t)|D_\varepsilon^-(t)| \\ & - (u_{k,\varepsilon,+}^{\mathrm{out}})'(t)\int_{|\rho|<\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}} 1_{\{\rho>0\}}dx - (u_{k,\varepsilon,-}^{\mathrm{out}})'(t)\int_{|\rho|<\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}} 1_{\{\rho<0\}}dx + O(e^{-\zeta\delta/\varepsilon}), \end{aligned}$$

as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, where $'$ means the derivative in t and we have used (2.39) which gives the error term $O(e^{-\zeta\delta/\varepsilon})$. Concerning the term III, change of variables and (81) of [3] lead us to

$$\begin{aligned} III =& \int_{\mathcal{S}}\int_{|\rho|<\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}} \big((V(t,s)\varepsilon^{-1} - \partial_t^\Gamma h_k^\varepsilon)\partial_\rho u_k^\varepsilon\big)\varepsilon J^\varepsilon(t,\rho,s)d\rho ds \\ & + \int_{\mathcal{S}}\int_{|\rho|<\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}} \partial_t^\Gamma u_k^\varepsilon \varepsilon J^\varepsilon(t,\rho,s)d\rho ds. \end{aligned}$$

As a result, we obtain

$$\int_D \partial_t u_k^\varepsilon(t,x)dx = (A) + (B) + (C) + O(e^{-\zeta\delta/\varepsilon}), \tag{3.4}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} (A) =& (u_{k,\varepsilon,+}^{\mathrm{out}})'(t)|D_\varepsilon^+(t)| + (u_{k,\varepsilon,-}^{\mathrm{out}})'(t)|D_\varepsilon^-(t)|, \\ (B) =& -\int_{|\rho|<\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}} \Big((u_{k,\varepsilon,+}^{\mathrm{out}})'(t)1_{\{\rho>0\}} + (u_{k,\varepsilon,-}^{\mathrm{out}})'(t)1_{\{\rho<0\}}\Big)dx \\ & + \int_{\mathcal{S}}\int_{|\rho|<\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}} \partial_t^\Gamma u_k^\varepsilon(t,\rho,s)\varepsilon J^\varepsilon(t,\rho,s)d\rho ds, \\ (C) =& \int_{\mathcal{S}}\int_{|\rho|<\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}} (V(t,s)\varepsilon^{-1} - \partial_t^\Gamma h_k^\varepsilon(t,s))\partial_\rho u_k^\varepsilon(t,\rho,s)\varepsilon J^\varepsilon(t,\rho,s)d\rho ds. \end{aligned}$$

In the following, we rewrite these three terms (A), (B) and (C). First, (A) can be rewritten as follows: Let us denote by $J(t,r,s)$ the Jacobian of the map (2.10). By the equation (44) and p. 538 of [3], we have

$$J(t,r,s) = J^0(t,s)\left(1 + \Delta d(t, X_0(t,s))r + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} r^i j_i(t,s)\right), \tag{3.5}$$

for some functions $j_i(t,s)$; see also (2.20). By (3.5), we get

$$\begin{aligned} |D_\varepsilon^-(t)| =& |D_t| + \int_{\mathcal{S}}\int_0^{\varepsilon h_k^\varepsilon(t,s)} J(t,r,s)drds = |D_t| + \int_{\mathcal{S}} \varepsilon h_k^\varepsilon(t,s)J^0(t,s)ds + (A_1), \\ |D_\varepsilon^+(t)| =& |D| - |D_\varepsilon^-(t)| = |D| - |D_t| - \int_{\mathcal{S}} \varepsilon h_k^\varepsilon(t,s)J^0(t,s)ds - (A_1), \end{aligned}$$

where D_t denotes the inside surrounded by the hypersurface γ_t^v and

$$(A_1) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathcal{S}} \Delta d(t, X_0(t,s))(\varepsilon h_k^\varepsilon(t,s))^2 J^0(t,s)ds + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1}\frac{1}{i+1}\int_{\mathcal{S}} j_i(t,s)(\varepsilon h_k^\varepsilon(t,s))^{i+1}J^0(t,s)ds.$$

Recalling the expansions of $u^{\rm out}_{k,\varepsilon,\pm}$ and $\varepsilon h^\varepsilon_k$ given in (3.1), we can decompose (A) into the sum of the following two parts, namely,

$$(A) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \varepsilon^i B^A_{i-1} + \sum_{i=k+1}^{\infty} \varepsilon^i \bar{B}^A_{k,i}, \tag{3.6}$$

where B^A_{i-1} is the term of order $O(\varepsilon^i)$ determined from d, $u^\pm_j$ and h_j, $0 \le j \le i-1$ and $\bar{B}^A_{k,i}$ denotes the term of order $O(\varepsilon^i)$ determined from d, $u^\pm_j$, h_j, $0 \le j \le k$ for $i \ge k+1$.

For (B), using (2.20) and the expansions of $u^\varepsilon_k = u^{in}_{k,\varepsilon}$ for $|\rho| < \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}$ and $u^{\rm out}_{k,\varepsilon,\pm}$ given in (3.1), we obtain

(3.7)

$$\begin{aligned}
(B) =& \int_{\mathcal{S}} \int_{|\rho|<\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}} \Big(\partial^\Gamma_t u^\varepsilon_k - (u^{\rm out}_{k,\varepsilon,+})'(t) 1_{\{\rho>0\}} - (u^{\rm out}_{k,\varepsilon,-})'(t) 1_{\{\rho<0\}} \Big) \varepsilon J^\varepsilon(t,\rho,s) d\rho ds \\
=& \sum_{i=0}^{k} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \int_{|\rho|<\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}} \varepsilon^{i+2} \Big(\partial^\Gamma_t u_i(t,\rho,s) - (u_i^+)'(t) 1_{\{\rho>0\}} - (u_i^-)'(t) 1_{\{\rho<0\}} \Big) \\
& \qquad \times \Big(1 + \varepsilon(\rho + \varepsilon h^\varepsilon_k(t,s)) \Delta d + \sum_{l=2}^{n-1} \varepsilon^l (\rho + \varepsilon h^\varepsilon_k(t,s))^l j_l(t,s) \Big) J^0(t,s) d\rho ds \\
=& (B_1) - (B_2),
\end{aligned}$$

where (B_1) and (B_2) are defined as the middle of (3.7) with the integral region $\{|\rho| < \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}\}$ replaced by $\mathbb{R}$ and $\{|\rho| \ge \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}\}$, respectively. Note that both (B_1) and (B_2) are finite, since we have from compatibility condition (2.39) and (2.41):

$$\Big(\partial^\Gamma_t u_i(t,\rho,s) - (u_i^+)'(t) 1_{\{\rho>0\}} - (u_i^-)'(t) 1_{\{\rho<0\}} \Big) = O(e^{-\zeta|\rho|}), \tag{3.8}$$

as $\rho \to \pm\infty$ for (t,s). Then, similarly to (A), we can decompose (B_1) into the sum of two parts and we obtain:

$$(B) = \sum_{i=2}^{k} \varepsilon^i B^B_{i-2}(t) + \sum_{i=k+1}^{\infty} \varepsilon^i \bar{B}^B_{k,i}(t) - (B_2), \tag{3.9}$$

where B^B_{i-2} is the term of order $O(\varepsilon^i)$ determined from d, u_j, $u^\pm_j$ and h_j, $0 \le j \le i-2$ and $\bar{B}^B_{k,i}$ denotes the term of order $O(\varepsilon^i)$ determined from d, u_j, $u^\pm_j$, h_j, $0 \le j \le k$ for $i \ge k+1$.

For (C), note that $V(t,s) = \Delta d(t, X_0(t,s)) - \bar\sigma \lambda_0(t)$ from (2.13) and (2.30), and $\partial_\rho u^\varepsilon_k = \partial_\rho u^{in}_{k,\varepsilon} = \partial_\rho m + \sum_{i=0}^k \varepsilon^{i+1} \partial_\rho u_i$ from (3.1). Recalling (2.20) again, we have

$$(C) = \int_{\mathcal{S}} \int_{|\rho|<\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}} \Big\{ (\Delta d(t, X_0(t,s)) - \bar\sigma \lambda_0(t)) - \partial^\Gamma_t \sum_{i=1}^{k} \varepsilon^i h_i(t,s) \Big\} \Big\{ m'(\rho) + \sum_{i=0}^{k} \varepsilon^{i+1} \partial_\rho u_i \Big\}$$

$$\times \Big\{1+\Delta d(t,s)(\varepsilon(\rho+h_k^\varepsilon(t,s)))+\sum_{i=2}^{n-1}(\varepsilon(\rho+h_k^\varepsilon(t,s)))^i j_i(t,s)\Big\}J^0(t,s)d\rho ds$$
$$=(C_1)-(C_2),$$

where (C_1) and (C_2) are defined by the above line with the integral region $\{|\rho|<\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}\}$ replaced by $\mathbb{R}$ and $\{|\rho|\geq\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}\}$, respectively. Then, in the term of order $O(\varepsilon^i)$ in the expansion of (C_1) in ε, separating terms containing h_i from those containing lower order functions $\{\nu_j\}_{j\leq i-1}$, and noting $\int_{\mathbb{R}}\partial_\rho m d\rho=2$, we can decompose (C_1) into the sum of the following four parts:

(3.10)
$$\begin{aligned}(C_1)=&2\int_{\mathcal{S}}(\Delta d(t,X_0(t,s))-\bar\sigma\lambda_0(t))J^0(t,s)ds\\&+2\sum_{i=1}^k\varepsilon^i\int_{\mathcal{S}}\Big((\Delta d(t,X_0(t,s))-\bar\sigma\lambda_0(t))\Delta d(t,X_0(t,s))h_i(t,s)-\partial_t^\Gamma h_i(t,s)\Big)J^0(t,s)ds\\&+\sum_{i=1}^k\varepsilon^i B_{i-1}^C(t)+\sum_{i=k+1}^\infty\varepsilon^i\bar B_{k,i}^C(t),\end{aligned}$$

where B_{i-1}^C is the term of order $O(\varepsilon^i)$ determined from d, λ_0, u_j, $u_j^\pm$ and h_j, $0\leq j\leq i-1$ and $\bar B_{k,i}^C$ denotes the term of order $O(\varepsilon^i)$ determined from d, λ_0, u_j, $u_j^\pm$, h_j, $0\leq j\leq k$ for $i\geq k+1$.

Setting

$$B_{k-1}=B_{k-1}^A+B_{k-2}^B+B_{k-1}^C, \tag{3.11}$$

and

$$\bar B_{k,i}=\bar B_{k,i}^A+\bar B_{k,i}^B+\bar B_{k,i}^C, \tag{3.12}$$

we obtain

(3.13)
$$\begin{aligned}&\int_D\Big(\partial_t u_k^\varepsilon(t,x)-v(t)\Big)dx\\=&2\int_{\mathcal{S}}\Big(\Delta d(t,X_0(t,s))-\bar\sigma\lambda_0(t)-\frac{|D|}{2|\gamma_t^v|}v(t)\Big)J^0(t,s)ds\\&+2\sum_{i=1}^k\varepsilon^i\int_{\mathcal{S}}\Big((\Delta d(t,X_0(t,s))-\bar\sigma\lambda_0(t))\Delta d(t,X_0(t,s))h_i(t,s)-\partial_t^\Gamma h_i(t,s)\Big)J^0(t,s)ds\\&+\sum_{i=1}^k\varepsilon^i B_{i-1}+\sum_{i=k+1}^\infty\varepsilon^i\bar B_{k,i}-(B_2)-(C_2)+O(e^{-\zeta\delta/\varepsilon}),\end{aligned}$$

from (3.4), (3.6), (3.9), (3.10) and noting $\int_{\mathcal{S}}J^0(t,s)ds=|\gamma_t^v|$. Recalling that $\lambda_0(t)$ is defined as in (2.29), the first term of the right hand side of (3.13) vanishes so that we can

rewrite as

(3.14)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_D \Big(\partial_t u_k^\varepsilon(t,x) - v(t)\Big)dx \\
=&\sum_{i=1}^k \varepsilon^i \Bigg[2\int_{\mathcal{S}} \Bigg((\Delta d(t, X_0(t,s)) - \bar\sigma\lambda_0(t))\Delta d(t, X_0(t,s))h_i(t,s) - \bar\sigma\lambda_i(t) - b(t,s)h_i(t,s) \\
&+ \frac{\bar\sigma}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}} A^{i-1}m'(\rho)d\rho + \bar\sigma\Big(v(t) - \frac{b(t,s)}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho(m'(\rho))^2 d\rho\Big)1_{\{i=1\}}\Bigg) J^0(t,s)ds + B_{i-1}\Bigg] \\
&+ \sum_{i=k+1}^\infty \varepsilon^i \bar B_{k,i} - (B_2) - (C_2) + O(e^{-\zeta\delta/\varepsilon}),
\end{aligned}$$

by using (2.37) for $\partial_t^\Gamma h_i$ and noting $\int_{\mathcal{S}} \Delta^\Gamma h_i(t,s)J^0(t,s)ds = \int_{\gamma_t^v} \Delta^\Gamma h_i(t,\bar s)d\bar s = 0$. We wrote Δ^Γ for the operator seen in the coordinate $s \in \mathcal{S}$, but we also write Δ^Γ for that defined in the coordinate $\bar s$ on γ_t. However, since $\lambda_i(t)$, $i = 1, \dots, k$ are defined as in (2.43), the first term of the right hand side of (3.14) vanishes. This explains the reason that we determine $\lambda_k(t)$ as in (2.43) and we obtain

$$\int_D \Big(\partial_t u_k^\varepsilon(t,x) - v(t)\Big)dx = \Phi_k^\varepsilon(t), \tag{3.15}$$

where $\Phi_k^\varepsilon = \sum_{i=k+1}^\infty \varepsilon^i \bar B_{k,i} - (B_2) - (C_2) + O(e^{-\zeta\delta/\varepsilon})$. Furthermore, note that each of (B_2) and (C_2) goes to 0 as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ exponentially fast due to the compatibility condition for m', $\partial_\rho u_i$ and $\partial_t^\Gamma u_i$.

3.3 Estimates for u_k and $u_k^\pm$

3.3.1 Bounds for spatial derivatives of b, X_0, d and $\mathbf{S}$

We introduce the following norms for $g \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+)$:

Definition 3.1. *For $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $T > 0$, we define $|g|_k \equiv |g|_{k,T}$ as*

$$|g|_{k,T} = \sum_{i=0}^k \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \left|\frac{d^i g}{dt^i}(t)\right|. \tag{3.16}$$

In the following, we take and fix a class $\mathcal{V}$ of functions $v \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+)$ and $T > 0$ satisfying that

$$C_{\mathcal{V},T} = \max(C_{\mathcal{V},T}^{(1)}, C_{\mathcal{V},T}^{(2)}) < \infty, \tag{3.17}$$

where

$$C_{\mathcal{V},T}^{(1)} := \sup_{\substack{v\in\mathcal{V}, s\in\mathcal{S},\\ r\in(-3\delta,3\delta)}} \Big\{ |\partial^{\mathbf{m}} d(\cdot, X_0(\cdot,s))|_{0,T},\ |\partial^{\mathbf{m}} S^l(\cdot, X(\cdot,r,s))|_{0,T}, \tag{3.18}$$

$$|\partial^{\mathbf{m}} X_0(\cdot,s)|_{0,T};\ 1\le l\le n-1,\ |\mathbf{m}|\le M\Big\}<\infty,$$

and

$$C^{(2)}_{\mathcal{V},T}:=\sup_{v\in\mathcal{V},s\in\mathcal{S},t\in[0,T]}\Big\{\big(\alpha_-(t,s)\big)^{-1},\,|\gamma^v_t|^{-1}\Big\}<\infty. \tag{3.19}$$

Here, in $C^{(1)}_{\mathcal{V},T}$, $M=M(K)\in\mathbb{N}$ denotes the maximal number of the degrees of spatial derivatives taken over the terms appearing in $\widetilde{A}^K$ which is defined below (2.38) and $\delta>0$ is chosen as in Section 2.2. Recall Section 2.2 for d, X_0, S^l and X determined depending on v, and $\partial^{\mathbf{m}}=\partial_{x^1}^{m_1}\cdots\partial_{x^n}^{m_n}$, $|\mathbf{m}|=\sum_{i=1}^n m_i$ for $m=(m_1,\cdots,m_n)\in(\mathbb{Z}_+)^n$. Moreover, in $C^{(2)}_{\mathcal{V},T}$,

$$\alpha_-(t,s)\equiv\alpha^v_-(t,s):=\inf_{\xi\in\mathbb{R}^{n-1}:|\xi|=1}\big(\alpha(t,s)\xi,\xi\big),$$

where $\alpha(t,s)=(\alpha_{ij}(t,s))_{1\le i,j\le n-1}$ is the matrix defined by (3.25) below, and $(\cdot,\cdot)$ and $|\cdot|$ denote the inner product and the norm of $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, respectively.

Later, for each $\omega\in\Omega$, we will take $\mathcal{V}\equiv\mathcal{V}(\omega):=\{\alpha\dot{w}^\varepsilon;0<\varepsilon\le\varepsilon_0^*\}$. Then, for a.s. ω, by Assumption 1.2, one can take $T=T(\omega):=\inf_{0<\varepsilon\le\varepsilon_0^*}\sigma^\varepsilon>0$ such that the equation (2.6) with $v=\alpha\dot{w}^\varepsilon$ has a solution up to the time $T(\omega)$ and $C_{\mathcal{V}(\omega),T(\omega)}<\infty$ holds.

Recalling the definition (2.14) of $b(t,s)$, the constant $C^{(1)}_{\mathcal{V},T}$ gives bounds for b. We need the bound $C^{(2)}_{\mathcal{V},T}$ for deriving estimates on the fundamental solution (see (3.45), Lemma 3.5) and on $\lambda_0(t)$ (see (3.57), Proposition 3.6).

3.3.2 Bounds for time derivatives of X_0, $\partial^{\mathbf{m}}X_0$ and $\mathbf{S}$

Our goal is to give estimates for u_k and $u_k^\pm$, see Proposition 3.6 and Corollary 3.7 below. To do this, we will prepare several lemmas. The inward normal velocity V is represented as $V(t,s)=\partial_t d(t,X_0(t,s))$ from (2.12) and

$$V(t,s)=\kappa(t,s)-\frac{1}{|\gamma^v_t|}\int_{\mathcal{S}}\kappa(t,s)J^0(t,s)ds+\frac{|D|}{2|\gamma^v_t|}v(t), \tag{3.20}$$

holds with $\kappa(t.s)=\Delta d(t,X_0(t,s))$ from (2.29) and (2.30). Let us formulate the following assumption on the time derivatives of $\partial^{\mathbf{m}}X_0$ and $\mathbf{S}$ by means of the norm of the forcing term v.

Assumption 3.1. *There exist some $N=N(K)\in\mathbb{N}$, $T=T(\mathcal{V})>0$ and $C_1=C_1(C_{\mathcal{V},T},K,T)>0$ such that*

$$\sup_{1\le i\le n}\sup_{s\in\mathcal{S}}|\partial_t^k\partial^{\mathbf{m}}X_0^i(\cdot,s)|_{0,T}\le C_1(1+|v|_{N,T})^N, \tag{3.21}$$

$$\sup_{1\le i\le n-1}\sup_{r\in(-3\delta,3\delta),\,s\in\mathcal{S}}|\partial_t^k\partial^{\mathbf{m}}S^i(\cdot,X(\cdot,r,s))|_{0,T}\le C_1(1+|v|_{N,T})^N, \tag{3.22}$$

for $k=0,1,\cdots,K$, $|\mathbf{m}|\le M$ and $v\in\mathcal{V}$.

Under the choice $\mathcal{V}\equiv\mathcal{V}(\omega)=\{\alpha\dot{w}^\varepsilon;0<\varepsilon\le\varepsilon_0^*\}$, Assumption 3.1 determines $\tau(\omega):=T(\mathcal{V}(\omega))$, up to which two bounds (3.21) and (3.22) hold. We will show in Section 5 that Assumption 3.1 is true for some $T=\tau(\omega)>0$ under a two-dimensional setting as long as the limit curve γ_t is convex.; see Lemma 5.1.

3.3.3 Schauder estimates for h_k

Recall that h_k are the solutions of (2.44), which is rewritten as

$$Lh_k + \mathcal{L}h_k = F_{k-1}, \tag{3.23}$$

where $L = L_t$ is a differential operator defined by

$$\begin{aligned} L =& \partial_t^\Gamma - \Delta^\Gamma - b(t,s) \\ =& (\partial_t + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} S_t^i \partial_{s^i}) - \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \Delta S^i \partial_{s^i} + \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} \nabla S^i \cdot \nabla S^j \partial^2_{s^i s^j} \right) - b(t,s), \\ =& \partial_t - \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} \alpha_{ij}(t,s) \partial^2_{s^i s^j} - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \beta_i(t,s) \partial_{s^i} - b(t,s), \end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha_{ij}(t,s) = \nabla S^i(t) \cdot \nabla S^j(t), \quad \beta_i(t,s) = -S_t^i(t) + \Delta S^i(t), \\ &s = (S^1(t), \cdots, S^{n-1}(t)) \in \mathcal{S}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

while $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_t$ is an integral operator acting on a function $u = u(s)$ defined by

$$\mathcal{L}_t u = -\frac{1}{|\gamma_t^v|} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \Big(\big(\Delta d(t, X_0(t,s')) - \bar{\sigma} \lambda_0(t) \big) \Delta d(t, X_0(t,s')) - b(t,s') \Big) u(s') J^0(t,s') ds',$$

and F_{k-1} denotes the right hand side of (2.44). Since v and the interface γ_t^v are smooth, it follows that (3.23) with an initial condition $h_k(0,s) = 0$ has a local unique solution for each v from general argument for second order parabolic partial differential equations.

Our goal is to obtain estimates for the solutions h_k of (2.44). To do this, we basically follow the argument given in Friedman [7] and derive the Schauder estimates. However, in our setting, the coefficients of the operators L and $\mathcal{L}$ determined from $v = \alpha \dot{w}^\varepsilon$ are not bounded in ε, but controlled by the constant $C_{\mathcal{V},T}$ and the norm $|v|_{1,T}$. We need to carefully study how the estimates for h_k depend on these diverging factors. We first treat the contributions of the operator L; see Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3. The contribution of the operator $\mathcal{L}$ will be discussed starting from (3.52) below.

For $\tau \in [0,T]$ and $\xi \in \mathcal{S}$, let $Z(t,s;\tau,\xi)$ be the fundamental solution of

$$\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} - \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} \alpha_{ij}(\tau,\xi) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial s^i \partial s^j} \Big) u(t,s) = 0, \quad (t,s) \in (\tau, T] \times \mathcal{S}, \tag{3.26}$$

that is, Z is a Gaussian kernel. Then, the fundamental solution Γ of L_t is constructed by the usual parametrix method. Namely, by regarding Z as the principal part of Γ, we can find Γ in the form

$$\Gamma(t,s;\tau,\xi) = Z(t,s;\tau,\xi) + \int_\tau^t \int_{\mathcal{S}} Z(t,s;\sigma,s') \Phi(\sigma,s';\tau,\xi) d\sigma ds', \tag{3.27}$$

where Φ is a function satisfying

$$\Phi(t,s;\tau,\xi) = L_t Z(t,s;\tau,\xi) + \int_\tau^t \int_{\mathcal{S}} L_t Z(t,s;\sigma,s')\Phi(\sigma,s';\tau,\xi)d\sigma ds'. \tag{3.28}$$

Let $\mu \in (\frac{1}{2},1)$ and fix it. Then, we have the following estimate on Γ.

Lemma 3.1. *The fundamental solution Γ has the estimate:*

$$|\Gamma(t,s;\tau,\xi)| \le C_8(1+|v|_N)^{\nu_0+\frac{N}{1-\mu}} e^{C_8(T\vee 1)(1+|v|_N)^{\frac{N}{1-\mu}}} \frac{1}{(t-\tau)^{\frac{n-1}{2}}} e^{-C_9\frac{|s-\xi|^2}{(t-\tau)}}, \tag{3.29}$$

for $0 \le \tau < t \le T$, $s,\xi \in \mathcal{S}$ with some $\nu_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, $C_8 = C_8(C_{\mathcal{V},T},T,\mu)$ and $C_9 = C_9(C_{\mathcal{V},T},T,\mu) > 0$.

Proof. Let us rewrite $L_t Z$ into

$$\begin{aligned} L_t Z(t,s;\tau,\xi) = &\sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} \Big(\alpha_{ij}(\tau,\xi) - \alpha_{ij}(t,s)\Big)\frac{\partial^2}{\partial s^i \partial s^j} Z(t,s;\tau,\xi) \\ &- \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \beta_i(t,s)\frac{\partial}{\partial s^i} Z(t,s;\tau,\xi) - b(t,s)Z(t,s;\tau,\xi). \end{aligned} \tag{3.30}$$

From (2.14), (3.25), (3.17) and Assumption 3.1, we have

$$|\alpha_{ij}(t,s) - \alpha_{ij}(\tau,\xi)| \le C_2(1+|v|_N)^N\big(|t-\tau| + |s-\xi|\big), \tag{3.31}$$

$$|\beta_i(t,s) - \beta_i(\tau,\xi)| \le C_2(1+|v|_N)^N\big(|t-\tau| + |s-\xi|\big), \tag{3.32}$$

$$|b(t,s) - b(\tau,\xi)| \le C_2(1+|v|_N)^N\big(|t-\tau| + |s-\xi|\big), \tag{3.33}$$

for some $C_2 = C_2(C_{\mathcal{V},T},T) > 0$. Then, according to [7], Chapter 1, (4.3) with $\alpha = 1$ and n replaced by $n-1$, we have

$$\Big|L_t Z(t,s;\tau,\xi)\Big| \le C_3 \frac{(1+|v|_N)^N}{(t-\tau)^\mu} \frac{1}{|s-\xi|^{n-2\mu}}, \tag{3.34}$$

for some $C_3 = C_3(C_{\mathcal{V},T},T) > 0$. Let us define

$$(L_t Z)_1(t,s;\tau,\xi) = L_t Z(t,s;\tau,\xi), \tag{3.35}$$

$$(L_t Z)_{\nu+1}(t,s;\tau,\xi) = \int_\tau^t \int_{\mathcal{S}} L_t Z(t,s;\sigma,s')(L_t Z)_\nu(\sigma,s';\tau,\xi)d\sigma ds'. \tag{3.36}$$

As is seen in [7] p. 14, the singularity of $(L_t Z)_2$ is weaker than that of $(L_t Z)_1$. Indeed, we have

$$|(L_t Z)_2(t,s;\tau,\xi)| \le \frac{C_4(1+|v|_N)^{2N}}{(t-\tau)^{2\mu-1}|s-\xi|^{(n-2\mu)+(1-2\mu)}}, \tag{3.37}$$

for some $C_4 = C_4(C_{\mathcal{V},T},T) > 0$; recall $\mu \in (\frac{1}{2},1)$. By applying similar arguments to $(L_t Z)_3$, $(L_t Z)_4$ ..., we can find an integer $\nu_0 > 0$ such that

$$\Big|(L_t Z)_{\nu_0}(t,s;\tau,\xi)\Big| \le C_5\Big((1+|v|_N)\Big)^{\nu_0}, \tag{3.38}$$

for some $C_5 = C_5(C_{\mathcal{V},T}, T, \mu) > 0$. In particular, the singularity disappears after ν_0-steps.

In what follows, we will show

$$\Big|(L_t Z)_{\nu_0+m}(t,s;\tau,\xi)\Big| \le C_6 \frac{\Big(C_7(1+|v|_N)^N\Big)^m}{\Gamma((1-\mu)m+1)}\Big((1+|v|_N)\Big)^{\nu_0}(t-\tau)^{(1-\mu)m}, \tag{3.39}$$

for some $C_6 = C_6(C_{\mathcal{V},T}, T, \mu) > 0$ and $C_7 = C_7(C_{\mathcal{V},T}, T, \mu) \ge 1$. In the case $m = 0$, this is clear from (3.38). Suppose that (3.39) holds for m, and let us show that this holds also for $m+1$. Indeed, using (3.36) with $\nu = \nu_0 + m$ and (3.34),

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|(L_t Z)_{\nu_0+m+1}(t,s;\tau,\xi)\Big| \le{}& C_3 C_6 \frac{\Big(C_7(1+|v|_N)^N\Big)^m}{\Gamma((1-\mu)m+1)}\Big((1+|v|_N)\Big)^{\nu_0}(1+|v|_N)^N \\ &\times \int_\tau^t (t-\sigma)^{-\mu}(\sigma-\tau)^{(1-\mu)m}d\sigma \int_{\mathcal{S}} |s-s'|^{-n+2\mu}ds',\end{aligned} \tag{3.40}$$

Changing the variable $\rho = (\sigma-\tau)(t-\tau)^{-1}$, we obtain

$$\int_\tau^t (t-\sigma)^{-\mu}(\sigma-\tau)^{(1-\mu)m}d\sigma = (t-\tau)^{(1-\mu)(m+1)}\frac{\Gamma(1-\mu)\Gamma((1-\mu)m+1)}{\Gamma(2-\mu+(1-\mu)m)}, \tag{3.41}$$

where we have used

$$\int_0^1 (1-\rho)^{a-1}\rho^{b-1}d\rho = \frac{\Gamma(a)\Gamma(b)}{\Gamma(a+b)}, \quad a,b>0, \tag{3.42}$$

and $\Gamma(a) = \int_0^\infty e^{-x}x^{a-1}dx$. Let us take

$$C_7 = \max\Big(C_3\Gamma(1-\mu)\sup_{s\in\mathcal{S}}\int_{\mathcal{S}}|s-s'|^{-n+2\mu}ds',\, 1\Big) \ge 1. \tag{3.43}$$

Note that the integral in (3.43) is finite because of $\mu \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$. Thus, (3.39) holds for $m+1$ with this choice of C_7.

Noting that

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{m=1}^\infty \frac{\Big(C_7(1+|v|_N)^N\Big)^m}{\Gamma((1-\mu)m+1)}(t-\tau)^{(1-\mu)m} \\ \le{}& \sum_{m=1}^\infty \frac{\Big(C_7^{\frac{1}{1-\mu}}(1+|v|_N)^{\frac{N}{1-\mu}}\Big)^{(1-\mu)m}}{\Gamma((1-\mu)m+1)}T^{(1-\mu)m} \\ \le{}& \sum_{m=1}^\infty \frac{\Big(C_7^{\frac{1}{1-\mu}}(1+|v|_N)^{\frac{N}{1-\mu}}\Big)^{[(1-\mu)m]+1}}{C_\Gamma[(1-\mu)m]!}(T\vee 1)^{[(1-\mu)m]+1} \\ \le{}& C_{\mu,\Gamma}(T\vee 1)(1+|v|_N)^{\frac{N}{1-\mu}}\sum_{m=0}^\infty \frac{\Big(C_7^{\frac{1}{1-\mu}}(1+|v|_N)^{\frac{N}{1-\mu}}\Big)^m(T\vee 1)^m}{m!},\end{aligned}$$

for some $C_{\mu,\Gamma} > 0$, where we have used $\Gamma((1-\mu)m+1) \geq C_\Gamma[(1-\mu)m]!$ with $C_\Gamma = \inf_{1\leq a<2}\Gamma(a)$ for the second inequality, we obtain

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\Big|(L_tZ)_{\nu_0+m}(t,s;\tau,\xi)\Big| \leq C_8(1+|v|_N)^{\nu_0+\frac{N}{1-\mu}}e^{C_8(T\vee 1)(1+|v|_N)^{\frac{N}{1-\mu}}}, \tag{3.44}$$

for some $C_8 = C_8(C_{\mathcal{V},T}, T, \mu) > 0$. By (3.44), recalling $C_{\mathcal{V},T}$ gives the lower bound for the diffusion matrix $\alpha(t,s)$ in the sense that $\alpha(t,s) \geq \big(C^{(2)}_{\mathcal{V},T}\big)^{-1}I$, and using [7], p. 16, we have

$$|\Phi(t,s;\tau,\xi)| \leq C_8(1+|v|_N)^{\nu_0+\frac{N}{1-\mu}}e^{C_8(T\vee 1)(1+|v|_N)^{\frac{N}{1-\mu}}}\frac{1}{(t-\tau)^\mu|s-\xi|^{n-2\mu}}e^{-C_9\frac{|s-\xi|^2}{(t-\tau)}}, \tag{3.45}$$

for some $C_9 = C_9(C_{\mathcal{V},T}, T, \mu) > 0$. Thus, by the standard argument (see [7], Chapter 1, Section 6), we obtain the estimate (3.29) for the fundamental solution Γ. □

Consider the following equation:

$$\begin{cases} L_tu(t,s) = f(t,s), & (t,s) \in (0,T]\times\mathcal{S}, \\ u(0,s) = u_0(s), & s \in \mathcal{S}, \end{cases} \tag{3.46}$$

for $f \in \overline{C}^\alpha$, $\alpha \in (0,1]$ and $u_0 \in C(\mathcal{S})$, where

$$\begin{aligned} &\overline{C}^\alpha = \{u(t,s)\,|\,|\overline{u}|_\alpha < \infty\}, \\ &|\overline{u}|_\alpha \equiv |\overline{u}|_{\alpha,T} = |u|_0 + \sup_{\substack{(t,s),(\overline{t},\overline{s})\\ \in[0,T]\times\mathcal{S}}}\frac{|u(t,s)-u(\overline{t},\overline{s})|}{\sqrt{|s-\overline{s}|^2+|t-\overline{t}|}^\alpha}, \\ &|u|_0 \equiv |u|_{0,T} = \sup_{(t,s)\in[0,T]\times\mathcal{S}}|u(t,s)|, \quad |s| = \Big(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1}(s^i)^2\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the argument of [7], Chapter 3, Section 3, Theorem 7 for our problem, we obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *There exists a unique solution u of (3.46) and $u \in \overline{C}^{2+\alpha}$, where*

$$\begin{aligned} &\overline{C}^{2+\alpha} = \{u(t,s)\,|\,|\overline{u}|_{2+\alpha} < \infty\}, \\ &|\overline{u}|_{2+\alpha} = |\overline{u}|_\alpha + \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=1}|\overline{\partial^{\mathbf{m}}u}|_\alpha + \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=2}|\overline{\partial^{\mathbf{m}}u}|_\alpha + \sum|\overline{\partial_t u}|_\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, the following lemma is shown by using [7], Chapter 5, Section 3, Lemma 2.

Lemma 3.3. *Let u be the solution of (3.46). Then, we have*

$$|u|_0 \leq K_1\Big(\sup_{s\in\mathcal{S}}|u_0(s)| + T\sup_{(t,s)\in[0,T]\times\mathcal{S}}|f(t,s)|\Big), \tag{3.47}$$

where

$$K_1 \equiv K_1(v) = C_{11}\,e^{2C_8(1+|v|_N)^p(T\vee 1)}, \tag{3.48}$$

for some $C_{11} = C_{11}(C_{\mathcal{V},T}, T, \mu) > 0$ and $p = p(\mu,\nu_0) \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Since the solution u is given by

$$u(t,s) = \int_{\mathcal{S}} \Gamma(t,s;0,\xi)u_0(\xi)d\xi + \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{S}} \Gamma(t,s;\sigma,\xi)f(\sigma,\xi)d\sigma d\xi, \tag{3.49}$$

we have

$$|u|_0 \le K_2\Big(\sup_{s\in\mathcal{S}}|u_0(s)| + \sup_{(t,s)\in[0,T]\times\mathcal{S}} t|f(t,s)|\Big), \tag{3.50}$$

where

$$K_2 = C_{10}(1+|v|_N)^{\nu_0+\frac{N}{1-\mu}}(T\vee 1)e^{C_8(T\vee 1)(1+|v|_N)^{\nu_0+\frac{N}{1-\mu}}}, \tag{3.51}$$

for some $C_{10} = C_{10}(C_{\mathcal{V},T}, T, \mu) > 0$ by Lemma 3.1; note that we have estimated $(1+|v|_N)^{\frac{N}{1-\mu}} \le (1+|v|_N)^{\nu_0+\frac{N}{1-\mu}}$ in the exponential, since $1+|v|_N \ge 1$. By choosing suitably large integer $p \ge \nu_0 + \frac{N}{1-\mu}$ and using $e^{2y} \ge ye^y$ for every $y \ge 0$, the proof is complete by taking suitable constant $C_{11} = C_{11}(C_{\mathcal{V},T}, T, \mu) > 0$. □

We now study the equation (3.23) for h_k taking the contribution of the operator $\mathcal{L}_t$ into account. Let us consider

$$\begin{cases} L_t u(t,s) = g(t,s,u), & (t,s)\in(0,T]\times\mathcal{S}, \\ u(0,s) = 0, & s\in\mathcal{S}, \end{cases} \tag{3.52}$$

where

$$g(t,s,u) = -\mathcal{L}_t u + F_{k-1}(t,s). \tag{3.53}$$

Lemma 3.4. *There exists a unique solution u of (3.52) satisfying*

$$|u|_{0,T} \equiv \sup_{(t,s)\in[0,T]\times\mathcal{S}} |u(t,s)| \le \Big(C_{13}K_3\Big)^{C_{13}K_3}|F_{k-1}|_{0,T}, \tag{3.54}$$

for some $C_{13} = C_{13}(C_{\mathcal{V},T}, T, \mu) > 0$ and

$$K_3 \equiv K_3(v) = e^{4C_8(1+|v|_N)^{1+p}(T\vee 1)}.$$

Proof. Let us note that $F_{k-1} \in \overline{C}^{\alpha}$ for each v; recall (3.23) and (2.44) for F_{k-1}. By Lemma 3.2, for given continuous functions $w = w(t,s)$ on $[0,T]\times\mathcal{S}$ and $\psi = \psi(s)$ on $\mathcal{S}$, the equation

$$\begin{cases} L_t u(t,s) = g(t,s,w), & (t,s)\in(0,T]\times\mathcal{S}, \\ u(0,s) = \psi(s), & s\in\mathcal{S}, \end{cases} \tag{3.55}$$

has a unique solution u; note that it holds $\mathcal{L}_t w \in \overline{C}^{\alpha}$, which depends only on t. Then, by Lemma 3.3 with $T = \delta$, we have

$$|u|_{0,\delta} \equiv \sup_{(t,s)\in[0,\delta]\times\mathcal{S}} |u(t,s)| \le K_2|\psi|_0 + K_2\delta|g(\cdot,\cdot,w)|_{0,\delta}, \tag{3.56}$$

for every $\delta \in (0,T]$. However, recalling the definitions of $\mathcal{L}_t$, $b(t,s)$ in (2.14) and $\lambda_0(t)$ in (2.29), and especially noting $1/|\gamma_t^v| \le C^{(2)}_{\mathcal{V},T}$ to estimate the second term of $\lambda_0(t)$, we have

$$|g(\cdot,\cdot,w)|_{0,\delta} \le C_{12}(1+|v|_0)|w|_{0,\delta} + |F_{k-1}|_{0,\delta}, \tag{3.57}$$

for some $C_{12} = C_{12}(C_{\mathcal{V},T}, T) > 0$, and therefore from (3.56),

$$|u|_{0,\delta} \le K_2|\psi|_0 + C_{12}K_2\delta(1+|v|_0)|w|_{0,\delta} + K_2\delta|F_{k-1}|_{0,\delta}, \tag{3.58}$$

Now choose $\delta \in (0,T]$ sufficiently small such that

$$\delta = \tfrac{1}{2}\Big(C_{12}K_2(1+|v|_0)\Big)^{-1} \wedge T \wedge 1, \tag{3.59}$$

and fix it. Set

$$R_1 = 2K_2\Big(|\psi|_0 + |F_{k-1}|_{0,\delta}\Big). \tag{3.60}$$

We denote the map $w \mapsto u$ on $C([0,\delta]\times\mathcal{S})$ determined by solving the equation (3.55) by Λ, so that $\Lambda w = u$. Then, for every w satisfying $|w|_{0,\delta} \le R_1$, (3.58) shows that $|\Lambda w|_{0,\delta} \le R_1$. In particular, Λ is a map on $C_{R_1} := \{w \in C([0,\delta]\times\mathcal{S}) \big| |w|_{0,\delta} \le R_1\}$. Moreover, for $w_1, w_2 \in C_{R_1}$, since $u := \Lambda w_1 - \Lambda w_2$ is a solution of (3.55) with $w = w_1 - w_2$, $\psi = 0$ and $F_{k-1} = 0$, we have from (3.58)

$$|u|_{0,\delta} \le C_{12}K_2\delta(1+|v|_0)|w_1 - w_2|_{0,\delta} \le \tfrac{1}{2}|w_1 - w_2|_{0,\delta}.$$

This implies that Λ is a strict contraction map. Therefore, the solution u of (3.52) satisfies

$$|u|_{0,\delta} = \sup_{(t,s)\in[0,\delta]\times\mathcal{S}} |u(t,s)| \le R_1, \tag{3.61}$$

where R_1 is that with $\psi = 0$.

Next, applying the above procedure to the equation (3.55) with t replaced by $t+\delta$ and ψ replaced by $u(\delta,\cdot)$, for the solution u of (3.52), we have

$$\sup_{(t,s)\in[0,\delta]\times\mathcal{S}} |u(t+\delta,s)| \le R_2, \tag{3.62}$$

where R_2 is given by R_1 with ψ replaced by $u(\delta)$ in (3.60). By repeating this procedure recursively, assuming $2K_2 \ge 2$ for simplicity (or we may replace K_2 by $K_2 \vee 1$ if necessary), we finally obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{(t,s)\in[0,T]\times\mathcal{S}} |u(t,s)| &\le \sum_{i=1}^{[\frac{T}{\delta}]+1} (2K_2)^i |F_{k-1}|_{0,T} \le (2K_2)^{[\frac{T}{\delta}]+2}|F_{k-1}|_{0,T} \\ &\le \Big(2K_2\Big)^{T\left(2C_{12}K_2(1+|v|_0)\vee T\vee 1\right)+2}|F_{k-1}|_{0,T},\end{aligned} \tag{3.63}$$

recall K_2 is given by (3.48). In particular, taking some $C_{13} = C_{13}(C_{\mathcal{V},T}, T, \mu) > 0$, the right hand side of (3.63) is bounded from above by $(C_{13}K_3)^{C_{13}K_3}|F_{k-1}|_{0,T}$. The proof is complete. □

As for the regularity of the solution u of (3.52), we have the following lemma. The proof is given based on the arguments in [7] or [17].

Lemma 3.5. *For the solution u of (3.52) satisfying (3.54),*

$$|u|_{2+\alpha} \leq K_4(|u|_0 + |F_{k-1}|_\alpha), \tag{3.64}$$

holds for $K_4 \equiv K_4(v) = C_{14}(1 + |v|_{n_0(K)})^{n_0(K)}$, where $C_{14} = C_{14}(C_{\mathcal{V},T}, T, \mu) > 0$ and $n_0 = n_0(K) \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. We can make use of [7], Chapter 4, Section 1, Theorem 1 and Chapter 4, Section 4 or [17], Chapter IV, Theorem 4.28, recalling $\alpha(t,s) \geq \big(C^{(2)}_{\mathcal{V},T}\big)^{-1} I$. Indeed, we rewrite (3.52) into

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} \alpha_{ij}(t',s')\partial^2_{s^i s^j} u - \partial_t u \\ &= \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} \Big(\alpha_{ij}(t',s') - \alpha_{ij}(t,s)\Big)\partial^2_{s^i s^j} u - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \beta_i(t,s)\partial_{s^i} u - b(t,s)u + \mathcal{L}_t u_t - F_{k-1}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.65}$$

with a fixed $(t',s') \in [0,T] \times \mathcal{S}$. Note that, as we saw for (3.57), we have

$$|\mathcal{L}_t u|_0 \leq C_{12}(1 + |v|_0)|u|_0. \tag{3.66}$$

Using (3.66), (3.31), (3.32) and (3.33), by proceeding similarly to the argument in [7] Chapter 4, Section 4, it follows that the upper bound K_4 can be chosen as a polynomial of the norms of v. Therefore, we obtain (3.64). □

3.3.4 Estimates for u_k and $u_k^\pm$

One can apply Lemma 3.5 for the solutions h_k of (3.23) to obtain estimates for them. Based on this, we have the following estimates for u_k and $u_k^\pm$.

Proposition 3.6. *For every $k = 0, 1, \ldots, K$,*

$$\sup_{(t,\rho,s)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathcal{S}} \big\{|u_k(t,\rho,s)|, |u_k^\pm(t)|\big\} \leq (C_{15}K_5)^{C_{15}K_5}, \tag{3.67}$$

holds for some $C_{15} = C_{15}(C_{\mathcal{V},T}, T, \mu) > 0$ and

$$K_5 \equiv K_5(v) = e^{n_1(K)(1+|v|_{n_1(K)})^{n_1(K)}(T\vee 1)},$$

with some $n_1 = n_1(K) \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. First note that the estimates for $|\partial^{\mathbf{m}} X_0(\cdot,s)|_0$ and $|\partial^{\mathbf{m}} S^j(\cdot,x)|_0$ for every $|\mathbf{m}| \leq M$ are given by Assumption 3.1. Recalling that u_0 and $u_0^\pm$ are determined by (2.32) and (2.34), respectively, since we have $|\lambda_0(t)| \leq C \cdot C_{\mathcal{V},T}(1 + |v|_{0,T})$ from (2.29) and $1/|\gamma^v_t| \leq C^{(2)}_{\mathcal{V},T}$ as we saw for (3.57), (3.67) is easily shown for u_0 and $u_0^\pm$.

From this, one can derive the estimate for F_0 defined by the right hand side of (2.44) with $k = 1$, since F_0 contains u_0, $u_0^{\pm}$ and b. Thus, the estimate for $|h_1|_0$ is obtained by Lemma 3.4. In addition, the estimates for $|\partial_t h_1|_0$, $|\partial_{s^i} h_1|_0$ and $|\partial^2_{s^i s^j} h_1|_0$ are obtained by Lemma 3.5. Similarly, the estimate for $|\partial^{\mathbf{m}} \partial_t^l F_0|_0$, $|\mathbf{m}| \le M$, $l \le K$ is obtained. Differentiating (3.23) and applying the above argument recursively, the estimates for $|\partial_t^l h_1|_0$ and $|\partial^{\mathbf{m}} h_1|_0$, $|\mathbf{m}| \le M$, $l \le K$ are also obtained.

Recall that u_1 is represented by using $\widetilde{A}^1$, which contains λ_0, u_0, h_1. Therefore, the estimate for $|u_1|_0$ is obtained from those for λ_0, u_0, h_1. Once we have the estimate for $|u_1|_0$, similarly as above, the estimate for $|F_1|_0$ follows. From this, we have the estimate for $|h_2|_0$ by Assumption 3.1.

In this way, the estimates for u_k, $u_k^{\pm}$, $k \le K$ are obtained recursively by deriving the estimate for each term in $\widetilde{A}^k$. Since K is finite and $\widetilde{A}^k, k \le K$ contain only finitely many terms, it is easy to see that there exists a suitable $n_1(K)$ such that (3.67) holds. The proof is complete. □

Finally in this section, we consider the random case taking $v(t) = \alpha \dot{w}^{\varepsilon}(t)$, where $w^{\varepsilon}(t)$ satisfies Assumption 1.1, and apply Proposition 3.6 for this case.

Corollary 3.7. *We assume Assumptions 1.1, 1.2 and 3.1, and define $G_\varepsilon \ge e^e, 0 < \varepsilon \le 1$, from H_ε appearing in Assumption 1.1 by the relation*

$$\log\log G_\varepsilon = H_\varepsilon^{2n_1(K)}, \tag{3.68}$$

where $n_1(K) \in \mathbb{N}$ is the number determined by Proposition 3.6. Then, we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} G_\varepsilon = \infty, \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{G_\varepsilon}{|\log \varepsilon|} = 0. \tag{3.69}$$

Furthermore, u_k and $u_k^{\pm}$ determined from $v(t) = \alpha \dot{w}^{\varepsilon}(t)$ as above satisfy

$$\sup_{(t,\rho,s) \in [0,T(\omega)] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{S}} \left\{ |u_k(t,\rho,s)|, |u_k^{\pm}(t)| \right\} \le G_\varepsilon, \quad 0 \le k \le K, \tag{3.70}$$

for every sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$ and every $\omega \in \Omega$, where $T(\omega) > 0$ is the minimum of that determined at the end of Section 3.3.1 and $\tau(\omega)$ given below Assumption 3.1 in Section 3.3.2.

Proof. The first one in (3.69) is clear from (3.68) and $\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} H_\varepsilon = 0$. For the second one, use twice that $\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{\log a_\varepsilon}{\log b_\varepsilon} = 0$ and $\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} b_\varepsilon = \infty$ imply $\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{a_\varepsilon}{b_\varepsilon} = 0$. To show (3.70), we see from Assumption 1.1 that $v = \alpha \dot{w}^{\varepsilon}$ satisfies

$$|v|_{n_1(K),T} \le (n_1(K) + 1) \alpha H_\varepsilon. \tag{3.71}$$

From this, one can verify

$$(C_{15} K_5)^{C_{15} K_5} \le G_\varepsilon, \tag{3.72}$$

for every sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, where the left hand side is the bound obtained in Proposition 3.6; note that $K_5 = K_5(v)$ with $v = \alpha \dot{w}^{\varepsilon}$. Indeed,

$$\log\log \left\{ (C_{15} K_5)^{C_{15} K_5} \right\} = \log C_{15} + \log K_5 + \log\log(C_{15} K_5), \tag{3.73}$$

whose leading term for small $\varepsilon > 0$ is $\log K_5$, and it has a bound

$$\log K_5 = n_1(K)(1 + |v|_{n_1(K)})^{n_1(K)}(T \vee 1) \le C\, H_\varepsilon^{n_1(K)} < H_\varepsilon^{2n_1(K)},$$

with some $C > 0$, by the definition of $K_5 = K_5(v)$ and (3.71), for every $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, since $\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} H_\varepsilon = \infty$. Note that, recalling the remark $C_{\mathcal{V}(\omega),T(\omega)} < \infty$ for $\mathcal{V}(\omega) = \{\alpha \dot{w}^\varepsilon; 0 < \varepsilon \le \varepsilon_0^*\}$ made at the end of Section 3.3.1, $C_{15} = C_{15}(C_{\mathcal{V}(\omega),T(\omega)}, T(\omega), \mu)$ is bounded in ε so that the other terms in (3.73) are much smaller than $\log K_5$. Thus, we obtain (3.72) for every $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough. Proposition 3.6 completes the proof. □

4 Proof of Theorem 1.1

4.1 The stochastic term $w^\varepsilon(t)$

This subsection gives two examples of $w^\varepsilon(t)$, which satisfy the condition (1.8) and Assumption 1.1. The integer K is fixed throughout the paper.

The first example is a mollification of the Brownian motion with an extremely slow convergence speed. Let $w = w(t)$ be the one-dimensional standard Brownian motion and set

$$\psi(\varepsilon) = \big(\log\log\log|\log\varepsilon|\big)^{\tilde\beta}, \tag{4.1}$$

with $\tilde\beta > 0$. Let $W_\varepsilon(t), \varepsilon > 0$ be the stopped process of w, that is, $W_\varepsilon(t) = w(t \wedge \tau(\varepsilon))$, where $\tau(\varepsilon)$ is the first exit time of $w(t)$ from the interval $I_\varepsilon = (-\psi(\varepsilon), \psi(\varepsilon))$, that is, $\tau(\varepsilon) = \inf\{t > 0,\, w(t) \notin I_\varepsilon\}$. We define $w^\varepsilon(t)$ by

$$w^\varepsilon(t) = \int_0^\infty \eta_{\psi(\varepsilon)}(t - s) W_\varepsilon(s) ds, \tag{4.2}$$

where

$$\eta_{\psi(\varepsilon)}(s) = \psi(\varepsilon)\eta\big(\psi(\varepsilon)s\big)$$

and η is a non-negative C^∞-function on $\mathbb{R}$, whose support is contained in $(0, 1)$, satisfying $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \eta(u)du = 1$.

Lemma 4.1. *For $w^\varepsilon(t)$ defined by (4.2), we have*

$$|\dot w^\varepsilon|_{k,T} \le k|\eta|_{k+2}\psi(\varepsilon)^{k+2}, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \tag{4.3}$$

In particular, Assumption 1.1 holds for this $w^\varepsilon(t)$ with the choice of $H_\varepsilon = n_1(K)|\eta|_{n_1(K)+2}\psi(\varepsilon)^{n_1(K)+2}$. The condition (1.8) holds obviously.

Proof. A simple computation shows (4.3). Once (4.3) is shown, the rest is obvious. □

Remark 4.1. *If we choose $\tilde\beta > 0$ as $2\tilde\beta n_1(K)(n_1(K) + 2) = 1$, we have $H_\varepsilon^{2n_1(K)} = (n_1(K)|\eta|_{n_1(K)+2})^{2n_1(K)} \log\log\log|\log\varepsilon|$. Since the condition (3.68) can be relaxed as $\log\log G_\varepsilon = C\, H_\varepsilon^{2n_1(K)}$ with any constant $C > 0$, one can choose $G_\varepsilon = \log|\log\varepsilon|$ for every small enough $\varepsilon > 0$.*

Let us give another example of $w^\varepsilon(t)$. Let $\xi = \xi(t)$, $t \geq 0$ be a stochastic process satisfying the following conditions, see [10]:

(1) ξ is a stationary and strongly mixing stochastic process defined on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$, that is, $\int_0^\infty \rho(t)^{\frac{1}{p}} dt < \infty$ for some $p > \frac{3}{2}$, where ρ is given by

$$\rho(t) = \sup_{s \geq 0} \sup_{A \in \mathcal{F}_{s+t,\infty}, B \in \mathcal{F}_{0,s}} \frac{|P(A \cap B) - P(A)P(B)|}{P(B)}, \quad t \geq 0,$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{s,t} = \sigma(\xi(u), u \in [s,t])$.

(2) $\xi(\cdot) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+)$, a.s. and $|\xi^{(k)}(t)| \leq M$, a.s., $k = 0, 1, 2, \cdots, K$ for some non-random $M > 0$.

(3) $E\big[\xi(t)\big] = 0$.

Let us define $\dot{w}^\varepsilon(t)$ as

$$\dot{w}^\varepsilon(t) = A^{-1}\psi(\varepsilon)\xi\big(\psi(\varepsilon)^2 t\big), \tag{4.4}$$

where $\psi(\varepsilon)$ is taken as in (4.1) and $A = \{2\int_0^\infty E[\xi(0)\xi(t)]dt\}^{1/2}$. Then, by a simple computation, we obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 4.2. *The process $\dot{w}^\varepsilon(t)$ defined by* (4.4) *satisfies*

$$|\dot{w}^\varepsilon|_{k,T} \leq \frac{Mk}{A}\psi(\varepsilon)^{2k+1}, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}_+.$$

In particular, Assumption 1.1 holds with the choice of $H_\varepsilon = Mn_1(K)\psi(\varepsilon)^{2n_1(K)+1}/A$.

Remark 4.2. *The process $w^\varepsilon(t)$ converges to the Brownian motion $w(t)$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ in law, see [10]. Therefore, for the condition* (1.8) *in* a.s.*-sense, we need to apply Skorohod's representation theorem.*

4.2 Error estimate

In this subsection, coming back to the situation we discussed in Corollary 3.7, we estimate the error term δ_k^ε defined by

$$\delta_k^\varepsilon(t,x) := \frac{\partial u_k^\varepsilon}{\partial t} - \Delta u_k^\varepsilon - \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}(f(u_k^\varepsilon) - \varepsilon\lambda_k^\varepsilon) + v(t), \tag{4.5}$$

with $v(t) = \alpha\dot{w}^\varepsilon(t)$. The corresponding quantity is introduced in [3], (9), but in our case, its bound involves an extra slowly diverging factor G_ε.

More precisely, in Sections 4.2–4.4, we assume a (non-random) $v(t)$ is given, and u_k and $u_k^\pm$ determined from this $v(t)$ satisfy the bound (3.70) in Corollary 3.7 with $T(\omega)$ replaced by T and for simplicity for every $\varepsilon > 0$, i.e.,

$$\sup_{(t,\rho,s) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{S}} \big\{|u_k(t,\rho,s)|, |u_k^\pm(t)|\big\} \leq G_\varepsilon, \quad 0 \leq k \leq K, \tag{4.6}$$

holds for every $\varepsilon > 0$. Later, we will apply the results obtained in these three sections for $v = \alpha\dot{w}^\varepsilon$ and $T = T(\omega)$.

Lemma 4.3. *There exists $C_{err} = C_{err}(K,T) > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times D} |\delta_k^\varepsilon(t,x)| \le \varepsilon^k C_{err} G_\varepsilon, \tag{4.7}$$

holds for every $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$ and $\varepsilon > 0$.

Proof. Note that the terms of order $O(\varepsilon^i)$, $i = 0, 1, \cdots, k+1$ do not appear in δ_k^ε by the method of the construction of approximate solutions. First, let us consider for (t,x) satisfying $|d(t,x)| \le \delta$, recall (3.2). Using the expansion of u_k^ε and λ_k^ε, defined by (3.1) and (3.2), combined with (2.21), (2.22), and from the condition (4.6), we obtain

$$\sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times D:|d(t,x)|\le\delta} |\delta_k^\varepsilon(t,x)| \le \varepsilon^k C_{err,1} G_\varepsilon,$$

for some constant $C_{err,1} = C_{err,1}(K,T)$.

On the other hand, for (t,x) satisfying $|d(t,x)| \ge 2\delta$, proceeding similarly to the case of inner solutions, we obtain

$$\sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times D:|d(t,x)|\ge 2\delta} |\delta_k^\varepsilon(t,x)| \le \varepsilon^k C_{err,2} G_\varepsilon,$$

for some constant $C_{err,2} = C_{err,2}(K,T)$.

Finally, at the points satisfying $\delta \le |d(t,x)| \le 2\delta$, we have $|u_k^\varepsilon(t,x) - u_{k,\varepsilon,\pm}^{\mathrm{out}}(t,x)| = O(e^{-\frac{\zeta\delta}{4\varepsilon}})$ by (2.39) and (2.41) (see also [3], p. 547). By setting $C_{err} = C_{err,1} \vee C_{err,2}$, the proof is complete. □

We prepare another lemma; recall that $\Phi_k^\varepsilon(t)$ is defined just below (3.15).

Lemma 4.4. *There exists $C_{err}^0 = C_{err}^0(K,T) > 0$ such that*

$$|\Phi_k^\varepsilon(t)|_{0,T} \le \varepsilon^k C_{err}^0 G_\varepsilon, \tag{4.8}$$

for $k = 0, 1, \dots, K$.

Proof. Recall that $\overline{B}_{k,i}$ has a prefactor ε^{k+1} and (B_2), (C_2) decrease to 0 exponentially fast as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$. Thus, the estimate for $|\Phi_k^\varepsilon(t)|_{0,T}$ is obtained by the condition (4.6). □

We may assume $C_{err} \ge C_{err}^0$ by taking $C_{err} \vee C_{err}^0$ for C_{err}.

4.3 The Allen-Cahn operator

The goal of this subsection is to show Lemma 4.6, i.e., the lower bound of the spectrum of the Allen-Cahn operator $-\varepsilon\Delta - \varepsilon^{-1} f'(v_k^\varepsilon)$, which is a linearization of the nonlinear Allen-Cahn equation around v_k^ε defined by

$$v_k^\varepsilon(t,x) = u_k^\varepsilon(t,x) - \frac{1}{|D|}\int_0^t \Phi_k^\varepsilon(s)ds, \quad 0 \le k \le K, \tag{4.9}$$

for $x \in V_{3\delta}^t$, where Φ_k^ε is the function defined as in (3.15).

An estimate similar to that in Lemma 4.6 is stated in [3], (10) (the condition $\int_D \phi dx = 0$ is unnecessary), in which they consider the linearization around u_k^ε. In our case, we need to take v_k^ε instead of u_k^ε, since the vanishing condition $\int_D (u^\varepsilon(t,x) - v_k^\varepsilon(t,x))dx = 0$ holds under this choice because of the effect of $v(t)$, as we will see in Lemma 4.7 below. This vanishing condition is needed for Lemma 4.8, which is shown by applying Poincaré's inequality.

The argument to show Lemma 4.6 relies on [2], Section 2. Note that the correction term of v_k^ε from u_k^ε (i.e., the second term of (4.9)) is small, but it involves a slowly diverging factor G_ε as is seen in Lemma 4.4. This gives the factor G_ε in Lemma 4.6, differently from [2], Theorem 2.3.

We denote by $v_k^\varepsilon(t,\rho,s)$ the inner solution of v_k^ε viewed under the coordinate (t,ρ,s) defined by (2.19). By Lemma 4.4 and the condition (4.6), it follows that v_k^ε, $2 \le k \le K$ is rewritten into

$$v_k^\varepsilon(t,\rho,s) = m(\rho) - \varepsilon\lambda_0(t)\theta_1(\rho) + \varepsilon^2 q^\varepsilon(t,\rho,s), \tag{4.10}$$

where $\theta_1(\rho)$ is the function given below (2.31) and $q^\varepsilon(t,\rho,s)$ is a function satisfying

$$\sup_{\rho\in\mathbb{R}} \sup_{s\in\mathcal{S}} \sup_{\varepsilon\in(0,1]} |q^\varepsilon(\cdot,\rho,s)|_0 \le C_{err} G_\varepsilon. \tag{4.11}$$

For measurable and integrable functions $\Psi(t,z,s)$, $\Phi(t,z,s)$, $\psi(t,r,s)$ and $\phi(t,r,s)$, $z \in I_\varepsilon \subset \mathbb{R}, r \in I_1, s \in \mathcal{S}, t \in [0,T]$, we define

$$L^s\langle\Psi,\Phi\rangle = \int_{I_\varepsilon} \big(\Psi_z\Phi_z - f'(v_k^\varepsilon(t,\varepsilon z,s)\Psi\Phi\big) J(t,\varepsilon z,s)dz, \tag{4.12}$$

$$L^s(\psi,\phi) = \int_{I_1} \big(\varepsilon\psi_r\phi_r - \varepsilon^{-1} f'(v_k^\varepsilon(t,r,s)\psi\phi\big) J(t,r,s)dr, \tag{4.13}$$

$$L^0\langle\Psi,\Phi\rangle = \int_{I_\varepsilon} \big(\Psi_z\Phi_z - f'(m(z))\Psi\Phi\big)dz, \tag{4.14}$$

$$\langle\Psi,\Phi\rangle = \int_{I_\varepsilon} \Psi\Phi dz, \quad \langle\Psi,\Phi\rangle_s = \int_{I_\varepsilon} \Psi\Phi J(t,\varepsilon z,s)dz, \tag{4.15}$$

$$\|\Psi\| = \langle\Psi,\Psi\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \|\Psi\|_s = \langle\Psi,\Psi\rangle_s^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{4.16}$$

$$(\psi,\phi)_s = \int_{I_1} \psi\phi J(t,r,s)dr, \quad |\psi|_s = (\psi,\psi)_s^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{4.17}$$

where $\Psi_z(t,z,s)$, $\psi_r(t,r,s)$ represents $\frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial z}(t,z,s)$, $\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial r}(t,r,s)$, respectively, $z = \frac{r}{\varepsilon}$, $J(t,r,s)$ is given by (3.5), and $I_\varepsilon = (-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$. Under these settings, the following lemma holds.

Lemma 4.5. *Let us set* $\overline{\lambda}_1(t,s) = \inf_{\|\Psi\|_s=1} L^s\langle\Psi,\Psi\rangle$, $s \in \mathcal{S}, t \in [0,T]$. *Then there exist constants* c_1, $c_2 > 0$ *depending on* K, T *and* $\varepsilon_{0,1} = \varepsilon_{0,1}(K,T) > 0$ *such that*

$$-c_1\varepsilon^2 C_{err} G_\varepsilon \le \overline{\lambda}_1(t,s) \le c_2\varepsilon^2 C_{err} G_\varepsilon, \tag{4.18}$$

holds for every $\varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_{0,1}]$ *and* $t \in [0,T]$.

Proof. This lemma is obtained in a similar manner to [2], Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2. We make use of notations appearing in their proofs. Under the transformation $\Psi = J^{-\frac{1}{2}}\hat{\Psi}$, we have

$$L^s\langle\Psi,\Psi\rangle = L^0\langle\hat{\Psi},\hat{\Psi}\rangle - \varepsilon\lambda_0(t)\int_{I_\varepsilon} f''(m)\theta_1\hat{\Psi}^2 dz + \varepsilon^2\int_{I_\varepsilon}\tilde{q}^\varepsilon\hat{\Psi}^2 dz - \varepsilon\Big(\hat{\Psi}^2\frac{J_r(t,\varepsilon z,s)}{2J(t,\varepsilon z,s)}\Big)\Big|_{z=-\varepsilon^{-1}}^{\varepsilon^{-1}}, \quad t\in[0,T], \tag{4.19}$$

where

$$\tilde{q}^\varepsilon(t,z,s) = \varepsilon^{-2}\Big[-f'(v_k^\varepsilon(t,x)) + f'(m(z)) + \varepsilon f''(m(z))\lambda_0(t)\theta_1(z)\Big] + \frac{1}{4}\Big[2J^{-1}J_{rr} - J^{-2}J_r^2\Big].$$

From the condition (4.6), Lemma 4.4 and (4.11), we have

$$|\varepsilon^2\tilde{q}^\varepsilon(t,z,s)| \le \widetilde{C}\varepsilon^2 C_{err}G_\varepsilon, \tag{4.20}$$

for some $\widetilde{C}(T,K) > 0$ independently of ε and s. Let $\overline{\lambda}_1^0$ be the principal eigenvalue of $\mathcal{L} = -\partial_\rho^2 - f'(m(\rho))$ in I_ε with Neumann boundary condition and let $\Psi_1^0(\rho)$ be the normalized eigenfunction corresponding to $\overline{\lambda}_1^0$. Set

$$\overline{\lambda}_2^0(t,s) = \inf_{\Psi\perp\Psi_1^0\,\|\Psi\|_s=1} L^0\langle\Psi,\Psi\rangle. \tag{4.21}$$

From (4.19) and (4.20) and noting that $\|\tilde{r}J^{-\frac{1}{2}}m'\|_s = \|\tilde{r}m'\| = 1$, where $\tilde{r} = \|m'\|^{-1}$, we obtain the upper bound:

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\lambda}_1(t,s) \le& L^s\langle\tilde{r}J^{-\frac{1}{2}}m',\tilde{r}J^{-\frac{1}{2}}m'\rangle\\ \le& \tilde{r}^2L^0\langle m',m'\rangle - \tilde{r}^2\varepsilon\lambda_0(t)\int_{I_\varepsilon} f''(m)\theta_1(m')^2dz\\ &+\tilde{r}^2\varepsilon^2\int_{I_\varepsilon}\tilde{q}^\varepsilon(m')^2dz + \varepsilon\tilde{r}^2\Big((m')^2\frac{J_r(t,\varepsilon z,s)}{2J(t,\varepsilon z,s)}\Big)\Big|_{z=-\varepsilon^{-1}}^{\varepsilon^{-1}}\\ \le& c_2\varepsilon^2C_{err}G_\varepsilon,\end{aligned} \tag{4.22}$$

for some $c_2 = c_2(T,K) > 0$ independently of ε and s. Here, for the last inequality, we have used (1.3), the fact that $\overline{\lambda}_1^0$ does not depend on v and is of order $O(e^{-\frac{3\zeta}{2\varepsilon}})$ for some $\zeta = \zeta(f) > 0$ (see [2] Lemma 2.1) and furthermore

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} f''(m)\theta_1(m')^2dz = 0.$$

From (4.22) and (3.69) of Corollary 3.7, we can choose some $\varepsilon_{0,1} \in (0,\varepsilon_0^*]$, (recall that ε_0^* is defined in Section 3.3.1) such that $\overline{\lambda}_1(t,s) \le \frac{\zeta}{4}$ holds for every $s\in\mathcal{S}$, $t\in[0,T]$ and $\varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon_{0,1}]$. Let $\Psi_1(t,z,s)$ be the normalized eigenfunction corresponding to the principle eigenvalue $\overline{\lambda}_1$ of

$$\mathcal{L}_s = -J^{-1}\frac{d}{dz}(J\frac{d}{dz}) - f'(v_k^\varepsilon(t,\varepsilon z,s)), \tag{4.23}$$

where $v_k^\varepsilon(t,\varepsilon z,s)$ is the function $v_k^\varepsilon(t,x)$ viewed under the coordinate (t,ρ,s) defined by (2.19). Then, similarly to the proof of [2] Lemma 2.1, we obtain that

$$|\Psi_1(t,z,s)| \le C_{\Psi_1} e^{-\frac{\zeta}{2}|z|}, \tag{4.24}$$

for $|z| \ge a_0+1$, where $C_{\Psi_1}>0$ is a constant independent of ε and v, and $a_0>0$ is a number satisfying $\inf_{|z|\ge a_0}(-f'(m(z))) \ge \frac{3\zeta}{4}$.

To show the lower bound for $\overline{\lambda}_1(t,s)$, for each $s\in\mathcal{S}$, $t\in[0,T]$ and $z\in I_\varepsilon$, set $\hat{\Psi}_1 = J^{\frac{1}{2}}\Psi_1$ and let us write $\hat{\Psi}_1 = a\Psi_1^0 + (\Psi_1^0)^\perp$ for some $a\in\mathbb{R}$. Then, by [2] Lemma 2.2, p. 1381, we obtain

$$\int_{I_\varepsilon} f''(m)\theta_1(\hat{\Psi})^2 dz = O(\|(\Psi_1^0)^\perp\|), \tag{4.25}$$

where $(\Psi_1^0)^\perp$ is the orthogonal complement of Ψ_1^0. In particular, there exist some constants $\alpha_i(a)>0$, $i=1,2$ such that

$$-\alpha_1\|(\Psi_1^0)^\perp\| \le \int_{I_\varepsilon} f''(m)\theta_1(\hat{\Psi})^2 dz \le \alpha_2\|(\Psi_1^0)^\perp\|, \tag{4.26}$$

for every $s\in\mathcal{S}$ and $t\in[0,T]$. Using (4.19) and (4.25), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\lambda}_1(t,s) &= L^s\langle\Psi_1,\Psi_1\rangle \\
&= a^2 L^0\langle\Psi_1^0,\Psi_1^0\rangle + L^0\langle(\Psi_1^0)^\perp,(\Psi_1^0)^\perp\rangle - \varepsilon\lambda_0(t)\int_{I_\varepsilon} f''(m)\theta_1(\hat{\Psi}_1)^2 dz \\
&\quad + \varepsilon^2\int_{I_\varepsilon}\tilde{q}^\varepsilon(\hat{\Psi}_1(t,z,s))^2 dz - \varepsilon\Big((\hat{\Psi}_1(t,z,s))^2\frac{J_r(t,\varepsilon z,s)}{2J(t,\varepsilon z,s)}\Big)\Big|_{z=-\varepsilon^{-1}}^{\varepsilon^{-1}} \\
&\ge a^2\overline{\lambda}_1^0 + \overline{\lambda}_2^0\|(\Psi_1^0)^\perp\|^2(t,s) - C_{\mathcal{V},T}\alpha_1\varepsilon(1+|v|_0)\|(\Psi_1^0)^\perp\| \\
&\quad - \tilde{C}\varepsilon^2 C_{err}G_\varepsilon - C_{\Psi_1}e^{-\frac{\zeta}{2\varepsilon}} \\
&\ge a^2\overline{\lambda}_1^0 + \overline{\lambda}_2^0\|(\Psi_1^0)^\perp\|^2 - C_{\mathcal{V},T}\alpha_1\varepsilon(1+|v|_0)\|(\Psi_1^0)^\perp\| \\
&\quad - \tilde{C}\varepsilon^2 C_{err}G_\varepsilon - C_{\Psi_1}e^{-\frac{\zeta}{2\varepsilon}},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.27}$$

for all $\varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon_{0,1}]$, where we have used (4.20), (4.21), (4.24) and (4.25) for the first inequality and (4.3) for the last one. Note that $\overline{\lambda}_1^0$ is of order $O(e^{-\frac{3\zeta}{2\varepsilon}})$, (see [2] Lemma 2.1). Then, boundedness of $\|(\Psi_1^0)^\perp\|$ is obtained from (4.27). Indeed, (4.27) is a quadratic inequality for $\|(\Psi_1^0)^\perp\|$ with coefficient $\overline{\lambda}_2^0(t,s)>0$. Since (4.22) holds and $\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}\varepsilon G_\varepsilon = 0$ ($\varepsilon|v|_0$ also converges to 0), boundedness of $\|(\Psi_1^0)^\perp\|$ is shown. Thus, we obtain $\overline{\lambda}_1(t,s) \ge -c_1\varepsilon^2 C_{err}G_\varepsilon$ for all $\varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon_{0,1}]$ with some constant $c_1>0$ independent of ε, t and s. Thus we have the lower bound of $\overline{\lambda}_1(t,s)$. The proof is complete. □

From Lemma 4.5 and [2] Theorem 2.3, we obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 4.6. *There exists a constant $C_A>0$ independent of ε and t such that for every $\varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon_{0,1}]$ and $\psi=\psi(t,\cdot)\in H^1(D)$, $t\in[0,T]$,*

$$\int_D \big(\varepsilon|\nabla\psi(t,x)|^2 - \varepsilon^{-1}f'(v_k^\varepsilon(t,x))\psi(t,x)^2\big)dx$$

$$\geq -C_A \varepsilon C_{err} G_\varepsilon \int_D \psi(t,x)^2 dx, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T,$$

holds.

Proof. The left hand side of the above inequality is bounded from below by $\varepsilon^{-1} \min_{s\in\mathcal{S}, t\in[0,T]} \overline{\lambda}_1(t,s)$. Indeed, for $\psi(t,x)$ satisfying $\int_D \psi^2(t,x)dx = 1$, if we define $\Psi(t,z,s) = \varepsilon^{1/2}\psi(t,\varepsilon z,s)$, then we have $\|\Psi\|_s = 1$ and easily see that $\overline{\lambda}_1(t,s) \leq L^s\langle\Psi,\Psi\rangle = \varepsilon\times$ the left hand side of the above inequality. Thus, from Lemma 4.5, the assertion is obtained. □

4.4 Estimate for the difference between u_K^ε and u^ε

Similarly to [3], (12), we take initial data $g^\varepsilon = g^\varepsilon(x)$ of (1.1) or (2.5) satisfying the following three conditions:

$$g^\varepsilon(x) = u_K^\varepsilon(0,x) + \phi^\varepsilon(x), \tag{4.28}$$

$$\|\phi^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(D)} \leq C_1^{-\frac{1}{p}} \varepsilon^K, \tag{4.29}$$

$$\int_D \phi^\varepsilon(x)dx = 0, \tag{4.30}$$

for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, where $C_1 > 0$ is the constant appearing in (4.35) in the proof of Theorem 4.9 below and $p = \min\{\frac{4}{n}, 1\}$ is the number which will be given in Lemma 4.8. Recall that $u_K^\varepsilon(0,x)$ is defined by (3.2) with $t = 0$ and $K > \max(n+2, 6)$ is fixed throughout the paper. Then the following lemma is shown by an elementary computation.

Lemma 4.7. *Let u^ε be the solution of* (2.5) *with initial data g^ε satisfying the conditions* (4.28) *and* (4.30). *Then, $\int_D R(t,x)dx = 0$ holds, where $R(t,x) = u^\varepsilon(t,x) - v_K^\varepsilon(t,x)$.*

Proof. First we decompose the integral $\int_D R(t,x)dx$ as

$$\int_D R(t,x)dx = \int_D \Big(u^\varepsilon(t,x) - \bar{v}(t)\Big)dx - \int_D \Big(v_K^\varepsilon(t,x) - \bar{v}(t)\Big)dx, \tag{4.31}$$

where $\bar{v}(t) := \int_0^t v(s)ds$. Then, from (1.7) with $\alpha\dot{w}^\varepsilon(t)$ replaced by $v(t)$, we see that the first integral in the right hand side of (4.31) is independent of t, and thus it is equal to $\int_D g^\varepsilon(x)dx$ by noting $\bar{v}(0) = 0$. On the other hand, recalling the definition (4.9) of v_K^ε, the second integral in the right hand side of (4.31) is rewritten as

$$\int_D \Big(u_K^\varepsilon(t,x) - \bar{v}(t)\Big)dx - \int_0^t \Phi_K^\varepsilon(s)ds.$$

However, integrating (3.15) from 0 to t, the first integral is equal to

$$\int_D u_K^\varepsilon(0,x)dx + \int_0^t \Phi_K^\varepsilon(s)ds,$$

so that we see that the second integral in (4.31) is equal to $\int_D u_K^\varepsilon(0,x)dx$. Summarizing these, we have

$$\int_D R(t,x)dx = \int_D \Big(g^\varepsilon(x) - u_K^\varepsilon(0,x)\Big)dx = \int_D \phi^\varepsilon(x)dx = 0,$$

by (4.28) and (4.30). This completes the proof. □

The next lemma is taken from [3], p. 530; see p. 547 and middle of p. 530 for the proof.

Lemma 4.8. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain. Let $p = \min\{\frac{4}{n}, 1\}$. Then there exists $C_n(D) > 0$ such that for every $R \in H^1(D)$ with $\int_D R(x)dx = 0$,*

$$\|R\|_{L^{2+p}(D)}^{2+p} \le C_n(D)\|R\|_{L^2(D)}^{p}\|\nabla R\|_{L^2(D)}^{2}, \tag{4.32}$$

holds. Furthermore, there exists a constant $C' > 0$ such that

$$R\big(f(u+R) - f(u) - f'(u)R\big) \le C'|R|^{2+p}, \tag{4.33}$$

for every $|u| \le 2$ and $R \in \mathbb{R}$.

The following theorem extends [3] Lemma 2 in our setting. Note that the difference between v_K^ε and u_K^ε is small; recall (4.9) and Lemma 4.4.

Theorem 4.9. *Let u^ε be the solution considered in Lemma 4.7 and assume* (4.28)–(4.30) *for the initial data g^ε. Then, for sufficiently small $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_1]$, where $\varepsilon_1 = \min(\varepsilon_{0,1}, e^{-1})$,*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|v_K^\varepsilon(t) - u^\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2(D)} \le C_2\varepsilon^{K-1}|\log\varepsilon|, \tag{4.34}$$

holds for some constant $C_2 = C_2(D, C_A) > 0$.

Proof. From (3.69), we can assume

$$C_1^{-\frac{1}{p}} \le T|D|^{\frac{1}{2}}C_{err}G_\varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{2C_AC_{err}G_\varepsilon T}{|\log\varepsilon|} \le 1, \tag{4.35}$$

for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, where the constant $C_1 = C_n(D)C' > 0$ is determined from the two constants given in Lemma 4.8. We can also assume

$$\varepsilon|\log\varepsilon||D|^{\frac{1}{2}}C_A^{-1}C_1^{\frac{1}{p}} \le 1, \tag{4.36}$$

for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$.

Similarly to the proof of Lemma 2 in [3], using (4.33) with $R = u^\varepsilon - v_K^\varepsilon$ and $u = v_K^\varepsilon$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\|R(t)\|_{L^2(D)}^2 + \int_D \big(|\nabla R(t,x)|^2 - \varepsilon^{-2}f'(v_K^\varepsilon)R^2(t,x)\big)dx \\ &\le \int_D \big(C'\varepsilon^{-2}|R(t,x)|^{2+p} + |R(t,x)\delta_K^\varepsilon(t,x)|\big)dx \\ &\le \int_D C'\varepsilon^{-2}|R(t,x)|^{2+p}dx + \|R(t)\|_{L^2(D)}\|\delta_K^\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2(D)}, \quad t \in [0,T]. \end{aligned} \tag{4.37}$$

Note that $|v_K^\varepsilon| \le 2$ holds for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$ because of the definition (4.9) of v_K^ε, the construction of u_K^ε, the condition (4.6) and Lemma 4.4 for $\Phi_K^\varepsilon(t)$. However, the

second term in the left hand side of (4.37) can be decomposed and be bounded from below as follows for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_1]$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varepsilon^2 \int_D \big(|\nabla R(t,x)|^2 - \varepsilon^{-2} f'(v_K^\varepsilon) R^2(t,x)\big) dx \\
&\quad + (1-\varepsilon^2) \int_D \big(|\nabla R(t,x)|^2 - \varepsilon^{-2} f'(v_K^\varepsilon) R^2(t,x)\big) dx \\
&\geq \varepsilon^2 \|\nabla R(t)\|_{L^2(D)}^2 - \bar{c}_1 \|R(t)\|_{L^2(D)}^2 - C_A\, C_{err} G_\varepsilon \|R(t)\|_{L^2(D)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, for the first term, we have used the assumption (iii) for f: $f'(v_K^\varepsilon(t,x)) \leq \bar{c}_1$, while for the second term, we have applied Lemma 4.6 with $\psi(t,x) = R(t,x)$ and omitted the factor $(1-\varepsilon^2)$. On the other hand, for the first term in the right hand side of (4.37), we can apply the interpolation inequality (4.32) and finally obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\|R(t)\|_{L^2(D)}^2 \leq & \|\delta_K^\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2(D)} \|R(t)\|_{L^2(D)} + \big(\bar{c}_1 + C_A\, C_{err} G_\varepsilon\big) \|R(t)\|_{L^2(D)}^2 \\
& - \varepsilon^2 \|\nabla R(t)\|_{L^2(D)}^2 \big(1 - C_1 \varepsilon^{-4} \|R(t)\|_{L^2(D)}^p\big), \quad t \in [0,T],
\end{aligned} \tag{4.38}$$

where $C_1 > 0$ is defined below (4.35).

Now, consider the time $T_\varepsilon \geq 0$ defined by

$$T_\varepsilon := \inf\Big\{ t \geq 0;\ \|R(t)\|_{L^2(D)} \geq C_1^{-\frac{1}{p}} \varepsilon^{\frac{4}{p}} \Big\} \wedge T.$$

If the above set $\{\cdot\}$ is empty, we define $T_\varepsilon = T$. The goal is to show $T_\varepsilon = T$ and the conclusion (4.34) based on this. From (4.28) and (4.29), we have $R(0) = \phi^\varepsilon$ and

$$\|R(0)\|_{L^2(D)} \leq C_1^{-\frac{1}{p}} \varepsilon^K, \tag{4.39}$$

for all $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_1$, which implies that $T_\varepsilon > 0$ since $K > \frac{4}{p} + 2$. Note that $K > \frac{4}{p} + 2$ follows from $K > \max(n+2, 6)$ and the choice of p: $p = \min\{\frac{4}{n}, 1\}$. On the other hand, from (4.38) and the definition of T_ε, which guarantees the non-positivity of the last term in (4.38) for $t \leq T_\varepsilon$, we obtain that for every $t \in [0, T_\varepsilon]$,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|R(t)\|_{L^2(D)} \leq 2 C_A\, C_{err} G_\varepsilon \|R(t)\|_{L^2(D)} + \|\delta_K^\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2(D)},$$

where we have estimated $\bar{c}_1$ as $\bar{c}_1 \leq C_A C_{err} G_\varepsilon$ for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$ from (3.69). Then, Gronwall's lemma shows that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T_\varepsilon]} \|R(t)\|_{L^2(D)} \leq e^{2 C_A\, C_{err} G_\varepsilon T_\varepsilon} \Big(\|R(0)\|_{L^2(D)} + \int_0^{T_\varepsilon} \|\delta_K^\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2(D)} dt \Big). \tag{4.40}$$

However, Lemma 4.3 implies

$$\int_0^{T_\varepsilon} \|\delta_K^\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2(D)} dt \leq T_\varepsilon \varepsilon^K |D|^{\frac{1}{2}} C_{err} G_\varepsilon,$$

and therefore, noting $e^{2C_A\, C_{err} G_\varepsilon T_\varepsilon} \le e^{|\log\varepsilon|} = \varepsilon^{-1}$ from (4.35), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{t\in[0,T_\varepsilon]} \|R(t)\|_{L^2(D)} \le& 2\varepsilon^{K-1} T|D|^{\frac{1}{2}} C_{err} G_\varepsilon \\ \le& \varepsilon^{K-1}|\log\varepsilon||D|^{\frac{1}{2}} C_A^{-1} < \varepsilon^{\frac{4}{p}} C_1^{-\frac{1}{p}},\end{aligned}$$

where we have used (4.39), (4.40), (4.35) and $T_\varepsilon \le T$ for the first inequality, (3.69) for the second for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, and then $K > \frac{4}{p} + 2$ and (4.36) for the last one. Thus, $T_\varepsilon = T$ holds, which implies that we obtain (4.34) by setting $C_2 = |D|^{\frac{1}{2}} C_A^{-1}$. The proof is completed. □

4.5 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Let γ_0 be a smooth hypersurface in D satisfying the conditions in Theorem 1.1.

Definition 4.1. *The solution of* (1.4) *with an initial hypersurface* γ_0 *means the hypersurface* $\Gamma = \bigcup_{0\le t<\sigma}(\gamma_t \times \{t\})$ *and* $(d(t\wedge\sigma), w(t\wedge\sigma)) \in C^2(\mathcal{O})\times\mathbb{R}$, $t \ge 0$, *with a stopping time* σ *defined on a probability space* $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ *equipped with the filtration* $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\ge0}$ *and* $\mathcal{O}$ *being an open neighborhood of* γ_0 *(cf. [21]) such that*
(i) $d(t,x)$ *is an* $(\mathcal{F}_t)$*-adapted signed distance of* $x \in \mathcal{O}$ *to* γ_t *for* $t \in [0,\sigma)$ *and satisfies* $|\nabla d| = 1$.
(ii) $w(t)$ *is an* $(\mathcal{F}_t)$*-Brownian motion.*
(iii) *The following stochastic integral equation holds in Stratonovich sense:*

$$\begin{aligned}d(t\wedge\sigma, x) =& d(0,x) + \int_0^{t\wedge\sigma} g(D^2 d(u,x), d(u,x))du \\ &- \int_0^{t\wedge\sigma} \frac{du}{|\gamma_u|}\int_{\gamma_u} \Delta d(u,\bar{s})d\bar{s} + \int_0^{t\wedge\sigma} \frac{\alpha|D|}{2|\gamma_u|}\circ dw(u), \quad x\in\mathcal{O}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.41}$$

Here $D^2 d$ *denotes the Hessian of* d *and* $g(A,q) = tr(A(I-qA)^{-1})$ *for a symmetric matrix* A *and* $q \in \mathbb{R}$.

It is not difficult to show that the solution $(\gamma_t^\varepsilon, d^\varepsilon) \equiv (\gamma_t^{\alpha\dot{w}^\varepsilon}, d^{\alpha\dot{w}^\varepsilon})$ of (2.6) with $v = \alpha\dot{w}^\varepsilon$ exists uniquely for each $0 < \varepsilon \le 1$ by employing the known results in deterministic case since $\dot{w}^\varepsilon$ is C^∞ in t. By Assumption 1.2, a unique solution $\Gamma = \bigcup_{0\le t<\sigma}(\gamma_t \times \{t\})$ and $(d(t\wedge\sigma), w(t\wedge\sigma))$ of (1.4) with an initial hypersurface γ_0 also exists.

We are now in the position to give the proof of the main theorem of this paper.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We assume Assumptions 1.1, 1.2 and 3.1, take initial data g^ε of (1.1) satisfying the three conditions (4.28)–(4.30) and fix $T > 0$ as in Assumption 3.1. Note that the solution of (1.1) exists uniquely for $t \in [0,T]$ a.s., since $\dot{w}^\varepsilon$ is C^∞ in t. By Corollary 3.7, the condition (4.6) holds for $v = \alpha\dot{w}^\varepsilon$ and $T = T(\omega)\wedge\tau(\omega)$; recall that $T(\omega)$ determined from σ^ε in Section 3.3.1 satisfies $T(\omega) \equiv T^{\varepsilon_0^*}(\omega) \uparrow \sigma(\omega)$ as $\varepsilon_0^* \downarrow 0$ a.s. and $\tau(\omega)$ is given below Assumption 3.1. Therefore, by (4.9), Lemma 4.4 and recalling the construction of u_K^ε, we see that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow0} \sup_{t\in[0,T(\omega)\wedge\tau(\omega)\wedge T]} \left\| v_K^\varepsilon(t,\cdot) - m\big(d^\varepsilon(t,\cdot)/\varepsilon\big)\right\|_{L^\infty(D)} = 0, \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{4.42}$$

Furthermore, it follows from Assumption 1.2 that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\left\|m\big(d^{\varepsilon}(t\wedge\sigma^{\varepsilon},\cdot)/\varepsilon\big)-\chi_{\gamma_{t\wedge\sigma}}(\cdot)\right\|_{L^2(D)}=0,\quad \text{a.s.} \tag{4.43}$$

Moreover, noting Corollary 3.7 again, Theorem 4.9 implies

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T(\omega)\wedge\tau(\omega)\wedge T]}\left\|u^{\varepsilon}(t,\cdot)-v_K^{\varepsilon}(t,\cdot)\right\|_{L^2(D)}\le C_2\varepsilon^{K-1}|\log\varepsilon|,\quad a.s. \tag{4.44}$$

From (4.42)–(4.44), we obtain

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}_+}\left\|u^{\varepsilon}(t\wedge\sigma^{\varepsilon}\wedge\tau\wedge T,\cdot)-\chi_{\gamma_{t\wedge\sigma\wedge\tau\wedge T}}(\cdot)\right\|_{L^2(D)}=0,\quad \text{a.s.}$$

The proof is completed, since $T=T^{\varepsilon_0^*}(\omega)\uparrow\sigma(\omega)$ as $\varepsilon_0^*\downarrow 0$. □

5 Local existence and uniqueness for the limit dynamics (1.4)

In this section we consider the stochastically perturbed volume preserving mean curvature flow (1.4), which appears in the limit. We write $c=|D|/2$ for simplicity. As explained in Section 1, the stochastic term destroys the volume conservation law. Here, we restrict ourselves in two-dimension and discuss under the situation that the closed curve γ_t stays strictly convex. We prove the local existence and uniqueness of the stochastic evolution governed by (1.4) by extending the method employed in [10], and show that Assumption 3.1 holds up to some stopping time $T=\tau(\omega)>0$ assuming Assumption 1.2 in a.s.-sense and then prove Assumption 1.2 in law sense for $\dot{w}^{\varepsilon}$ given by (4.4). The difference between a.s.-sense and law sense can be filled by applying Skorohod's theorem and changing the probability space as we pointed out in Section 1.

A strictly convex closed plane curve γ can be parameterized by $\theta\in S:=[0,2\pi)$ in terms of the Gauss map, that is, the position X_0 on γ is denoted by $X_0(\theta)$ if the angle between one fixed direction $\mathbf{e}:=(1,0)$ in the plane $\mathbb{R}^2$ and the outward normal $\vec{n}(X_0)$ at X_0 to γ is θ. The set S or a unit circle in $\mathbb{R}^2$ plays a role of the reference manifold $\mathcal{S}$. We further denote by $\kappa=\kappa(\theta)>0$ the curvature of γ at $X_0=X_0(\theta)$. Under these notation, the dynamics (1.4) is rewritten into the stochastic integro-differential equation for $\kappa=\kappa(t,\theta)$:

$$\frac{\partial\kappa}{\partial t}=\kappa^2\frac{\partial^2\kappa}{\partial\theta^2}+\kappa^3-\kappa^2\cdot\bar{\kappa}+\frac{c\alpha\kappa^2}{|\gamma|}\circ\dot{w}(t), \tag{5.1}$$

where $\bar{\kappa}$ denotes the average of κ over the curve $\gamma=\gamma_t$ and $|\gamma|$ stands for the length of γ; heuristically (5.1) is derived by applying [14] p. 17, (2.20) with $V=\kappa-\bar{\kappa}+\frac{c\alpha}{|\gamma|}\dot{w}(t)$ and see also [10]. The volume (length) element $d\bar{\theta}$ on γ is given by $d\bar{\theta}=|\partial_\theta X_0(\theta)|d\theta$. Since $X_0(\theta)\in\mathbb{R}^2\cong\mathbb{C}$ is written as

$$X_0(\theta)=X_0(0)-\sqrt{-1}\int_0^{\theta}\frac{e^{\sqrt{-1}\theta'}}{\kappa(\theta')}d\theta',$$

we see that $|\partial_\theta X_0(\theta)| = 1/\kappa(\theta)$. Therefore, $\bar\kappa$ and $|\gamma|$ are given by

$$|\gamma| := \int_S |\partial_\theta X_0(\theta)| d\theta = \int_S \frac{d\theta}{\kappa(\theta)}, \tag{5.2}$$

$$\bar\kappa := \frac{1}{|\gamma|}\int_S \kappa(\theta)|\partial_\theta X_0(\theta)| d\theta = \frac{2\pi}{|\gamma|} = 2\pi\Big(\int_S \frac{d\theta}{\kappa(\theta)}\Big)^{-1}, \tag{5.3}$$

respectively, which are functionals of $\kappa = \{\kappa(\theta); \theta \in S\}$.

As in [10], we introduce a cut-off because of the singularity in (5.1). For $L \in \mathbb{N}$, we define a cut-off function $\chi_L \in C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ (in particular, $\chi_L, \chi_L', \dots$ are all bounded) such that $\chi_L(x) = x$ for $x \in [1/L, L]$ and $1/2L \le \chi_L(x) \le 2L$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, and set

$$\begin{aligned} &|\gamma|_L \equiv |\gamma|_L(\kappa(\cdot)) = \int_S \frac{d\theta}{\chi_L(\kappa(\theta))}, \\ &a_L(\kappa) = \chi_L^2(\kappa), \\ &b_L(\theta, \kappa(\cdot)) = \chi_L^3(\kappa(\theta)) - 2\pi\chi_L^2(\kappa(\theta))|\gamma|_L^{-1}, \\ &h_L(\theta, \kappa(\cdot)) = c\alpha\chi_L^2(\kappa(\theta))|\gamma|_L^{-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

Fixing L for a while and denoting a_L, b_L, h_L by a, b, h for simplicity, we consider the stochastic integro-differential equation with cut-off for $\kappa = \kappa(t, \theta)$:

$$\frac{\partial\kappa}{\partial t} = a(\kappa)\frac{\partial^2\kappa}{\partial\theta^2} + b(\cdot, \kappa) + h(\cdot, \kappa) \circ \dot w(t), \quad t > 0,\ \theta \in S. \tag{5.5}$$

We also consider the dynamics (2.6) with $v(t) = \alpha\dot w^\varepsilon(t)$, which is described by the integro-differential equation:

$$\frac{\partial\kappa}{\partial t} = a(\kappa)\frac{\partial^2\kappa}{\partial\theta^2} + b(\cdot, \kappa) + h(\cdot, \kappa)\dot w^\varepsilon(t), \quad t > 0,\ \theta \in S, \tag{5.6}$$

by replacing $\dot w(t)$ in (5.5) with $\dot w^\varepsilon(t)$. We gave two examples of smooth noises $\dot w^\varepsilon(t)$ in Section 4.1. Since $\dot w^\varepsilon(t)$ is smooth in t, (5.6) has a unique solution for every ω.

We now show that Assumption 3.1 holds with the choice $\mathcal{V} = \{\alpha\dot w^\varepsilon; 0 < \varepsilon \le \varepsilon_0^*\}$ in the setting of this section and assuming Assumption 1.2 in a.s.-sense. The dynamics (2.6) is rewritten into the integro-differential equation for $\kappa = \kappa(t, \theta)$:

$$\frac{\partial\kappa}{\partial t} = \kappa^2\frac{\partial^2\kappa}{\partial\theta^2} + \kappa^3 - \kappa^2 \cdot \bar\kappa + \frac{c\kappa^2}{|\gamma^v|}v, \tag{5.7}$$

where the averaged curvature $\bar\kappa$ and the length $|\gamma^v|$ are determined from $\kappa = \kappa(t)$ by (5.3) and (5.2), respectively. Note that the curve $\gamma_t^v = \{X_0(t, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^2; \theta \in S\}$ is recovered from $\{\kappa(s); s \le t\}$ and $X_0(0, 0)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} X_0(t, \theta) = X_0(0, 0) &+ \Big(\int_0^\theta \frac{\sin\theta'}{\kappa(t, \theta')}d\theta', -\int_0^\theta \frac{\cos\theta'}{\kappa(t, \theta')}d\theta'\Big) \\ &+ \Big(\int_0^t (\kappa(s, 0) + \bar\kappa(s) - \frac{c}{|\gamma_s|}v(s))ds, \int_0^t \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}\kappa(s, 0)ds\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

Once γ_t^v is determined, one can define the signed distance function $d^v(t,x)$.

We consider the time

$$\tau_L^v = \inf\left\{ t>0; m(\kappa_t) > L \text{ or } \mathrm{dist}(\gamma_t, \partial D) < \frac{1}{L} \text{ or } \inf_{x\in V_{3\delta}^t} (I_2 + d(t,x)\nabla^2 d(t,x)) < \frac{1}{L} \right\},$$

where I_2 is the unit matrix, $m(\kappa) = \max_{\theta\in S}\left\{\kappa(\theta), \kappa(\theta)^{-1}, |\kappa^{(1)}(\theta)|\right\}$, $\kappa^{(n)} = \partial^n\kappa/\partial\theta^n$, $\kappa_t = \kappa(t) \equiv \kappa^v(t)$ is the solution of (5.7), and $\gamma_t = \gamma_t^v$ and $d(t,x) = d^v(t,x)$ are determined as above. We define the stopping time $\tau_L^\varepsilon := \tau_L^v$ with $v = \alpha\dot{w}^\varepsilon$; in other words, τ_L^ε is the stopping time for the solution of (5.6). Note that the uniqueness of solutions implies that the solution of (5.6) coincides with that of (5.7) with $v = \alpha\dot{w}^\varepsilon$ for $0 \le t \le \tau_L^\varepsilon$. The reason that we care $I_2 + d\nabla^2 d$ will be clear in (5.18).

We are now in the position to show Assumption 3.1 assuming Assumption 1.2 in a.s.-sense.

Lemma 5.1. *For every $L \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist $N = N(K) \in \mathbb{N}$, a stopping time $T = \tau(\omega) > 0$ and $C = C(C_{\mathcal{V},T}, K, T, L) > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{1\le i\le 2}\sup_{\theta\in S} |\partial_t^k \partial_\theta^m X_0^i(\cdot,\theta)|_{0,T} \le C(1+|v|_{N,T})^N, \tag{5.9}$$

$$\sup_{x\in V_{3\delta}^t} |\partial_t^k \partial^{\mathbf{m}}\theta(\cdot,x)|_{0,T} \le C(1+|v|_{N,T})^N, \tag{5.10}$$

for every $v \in \mathcal{V} = \{\alpha\dot{w}^\varepsilon; 0 < \varepsilon \le \varepsilon_0^*\}$, $k = 0, 1, \cdots, K$ and $m, |\mathbf{m}| \le M$, where $\theta(t,x) = \mathbf{S}(t,x) \in S$ is the inverse function of $x = X_0(t,\theta) + r\vec{n}(X_0(t,\theta))$ defined below (2.10).

Proof. Using (5.2) and (5.3), (5.7) and (5.8) are rewritten into

$$\frac{\partial\kappa}{\partial t} = \kappa^2\frac{\partial^2\kappa}{\partial\theta^2} + \kappa^3 - 2\pi\kappa^2\Big(\int_S \frac{d\theta'}{\kappa(\theta')}\Big)^{-1} - c\kappa^2\Big(\int_S \frac{d\theta'}{\kappa(\theta')}\Big)^{-1} v, \tag{5.11}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} X_0(t,\theta) &= X_0(0,0) + \left(\int_0^\theta \frac{\sin\theta'}{\kappa(t,\theta')}d\theta', -\int_0^\theta \frac{\cos\theta'}{\kappa(t,\theta')}d\theta'\right) \\ &+ \left(\int_0^t \Big[\kappa(s,0) + 2\pi\Big(\int_S \frac{d\theta'}{\kappa(s,\theta')}\Big)^{-1} - c\Big(\int_S \frac{d\theta'}{\kappa(s,\theta')}\Big)^{-1} v(s)\Big]ds, \int_0^t \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}\kappa(s,0)ds\right), \end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

respectively. Differentiating the both sides of (5.12) in t, $\partial_t\kappa(t,\theta)$ appears from the derivative of the right hand side and $\partial_t\kappa(t,\theta)$ is represented by the right hand side of (5.11). In addition, $\dot{v}$ appears from the derivative of the right hand side.

On the other hand, differentiating the both sides of (5.12) in θ, $\partial_\theta\kappa(t,\theta)$ appears from the derivative of the right hand side. Since κ, $\bar{\kappa}$, $\partial_\theta\kappa$ and $\partial_\theta^2\kappa$ are bounded up to τ_L^ε due to the definition of τ_L^ε, we have

$$\sup_{1\le i\le 2}\sup_{\theta\in S} |\partial_t\partial_\theta X_0^i(\cdot,\theta)|_{0,T} \le C\cdot C_{\mathcal{V},T}(1+|v|_{1,T}), \tag{5.13}$$

with some $C > 0$ and $T = \tau(\omega) := \inf_{0<\varepsilon\le\varepsilon_0^*}\tau_L^\varepsilon(\omega) > 0$. Note that $\tau(\omega) > 0$ a.s. due to Assumption 1.2 in a.s.-sense. Estimates for higher order derivatives of $X_0(t,\theta)$ in t and

θ are obtained recursively by direct computations using (5.12) and (5.11). Therefore, we can conclude that the bound (5.9) holds with some $N = N_1 \equiv N_1(K) \in \mathbb{N}$.

Next, we show (5.10). From (3.20), noting again that γ_t^v is parametrized by $\theta \in S$, we have

$$\partial_t d(t, X_0(t,\theta)) = \Delta d(t, X_0(t,\theta)) - \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi} \Delta d(t, X_0(t,\theta'))J^0(t,\theta')d\theta' + \frac{c}{|\gamma_t^v|}v(t), \tag{5.14}$$

where $J^0(t,\theta) = |\partial_\theta X_0(t,\theta)|\big(= 1/\kappa(t,\theta)\big)$ defined by (2.8) noting that $\mathbf{n}(t,\theta)$ and $\partial_\theta X_0(t,\theta)$ are perpendicular, and, from (2.7), (2.10) and (2.11), we have

$$x = X_0(t,\theta) + d(t,x)\nabla d(t, X_0(t,\theta)), \quad |d(t,x)| < 3\delta. \tag{5.15}$$

From now on, we omit the variables (t,θ) in short. Differentiating (5.15) in t, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{R}^2 \ni 0 =& \partial_t X_0 + \partial_\theta X_0 \partial_t\theta + \partial_t d\nabla d + d\nabla\partial_t d \\ &+ d\nabla^2 d\partial_t X_0 + d\nabla^2 d\,\partial_\theta X_0 \partial_t\theta,\end{aligned} \tag{5.16}$$

where $\theta = \theta(t,x)$ is the inverse function of (5.15). Substituting (5.14) into (5.16) and noting v does not depend on x, we have

$$\begin{aligned}0 =& \partial_t X_0 + \partial_\theta X_0 \partial_t\theta + \Big(\Delta d - \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi} \Delta d|\partial_\theta X_0| + \frac{c}{|\gamma^v|}v\Big)\nabla d \\ &+ (\nabla\Delta d)d + d\nabla^2 d\partial_t X_0 + d\nabla^2 d\,\partial_\theta X_0\partial_t\theta.\end{aligned} \tag{5.17}$$

Thus, (5.17) is rewritten into

$$\begin{aligned}&(I_2 + d\nabla^2 d)\partial_\theta X_0\partial_t\theta \\ =& -\partial_t X_0 - d\nabla^2 d\,\partial_t X_0 - (\nabla\Delta d)d - \Big(\Delta d - \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi}\Delta d|\partial_\theta X_0| + \frac{c}{|\gamma^v|}v\Big)\nabla d.\end{aligned}$$

Since $(I_2 + d\nabla^2 d)$ is equal to the Jacobian J of the diffeomorphism map from x to (r,s), it is invertible. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\theta X_0\partial_t\theta =& -(I_2 + d\nabla^2 d)^{-1} \\ &\times \Big(\partial_t X_0 + d\nabla^2 d\partial_t X_0 + (\nabla\Delta d)d + \Big(\Delta d - \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi}\Delta d|\partial_\theta X_0| + \frac{c}{|\gamma^v|}v\Big)\nabla d\Big).\end{aligned} \tag{5.18}$$

Note that $|\partial_\theta X_0| \geq \frac{1}{L}$, $|I_2 + d\nabla^2 d| \geq \frac{1}{L}$, $|\gamma_t^v| \geq \frac{2\pi}{L}$ hold for $0 \leq t \leq \tau_L^\varepsilon$. Indeed, as we saw above (5.2), $|\partial_\theta X_0| = 1/\kappa \geq \frac{1}{L}$ up to the time τ_L^ε. The second is clear by the definition of τ_L^ε, while $|\gamma_t^v| \geq \frac{2\pi}{L}$ follows from (5.2). Therefore, we obtain from (5.18) and (5.13)

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\sup_{x\in V_{3\delta}^t}|\partial_t\theta(t,x)| \leq C\cdot C_{\mathcal{V},T}(1 + |v|_{1,T}), \tag{5.19}$$

with some $C > 0$ and $T = \tau(\omega)$. Thus, we have obtained the estimates for $\partial_t\theta$. Estimates for higher order derivatives of $\theta(t,x)$ in t are obtained by differentiating (5.18) recursively and combined with (5.9).

Differentiating the both sides of (5.18) in x_j, $j = 1, 2$, the estimate for $\partial_t \partial_{x_j} \theta(t, x)$ is obtained by that for (5.9) with $k = 1$ and $|\mathbf{m}| = 1$. Similarly, estimates for derivatives of $\partial^{\mathbf{m}} \theta(t, x)$ in t are shown by recursively differentiating (5.18) in spatial variables. Therefore, we can derive the upper bound of each of them of the form $C \cdot C_{\mathcal{V},T}(1 + |v|_{N_2,T})^{N_2}$, with some $N_2 = N_2(K) \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular, (5.9) and (5.10) also hold for $N = \max(N_1, N_2)$. Thus, the proof is complete. □

The next task is to show that Assumption 1.2 holds in law sense in our setting. We prepare the following theorem which gives the construction of the solution of (5.5) and therefore the local solution of (5.1) in law sense, and shows the convergence in law of the solution of (5.7) with $v(t) = \alpha \dot{w}^\varepsilon(t)$ to that of (5.1) locally in time. We use the usual martingale method. Since this is similar to [10], Section 5, the details are omitted; see Proposition 5.15 and Theorem 5.16 stated below. The noise $\dot{w}^\varepsilon(t)$ is taken same as the second example given in Section 4.1, i.e., as in (4.4).

Theorem 5.2. *For each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $L > 0$ and $T > 0$, let P^ε be the distribution of the solution $\kappa^\varepsilon(t, \cdot)$ of (5.6) on $C([0, T], C^m(S))$. Then, $\{P^\varepsilon\}_{0<\varepsilon<1}$ is tight.*

To prove this theorem, we need to show the following two propositions; see Theorems 6.1 and 4.2 in [10] for the first proposition and Proposition 4.1 in [10] for the second. Note that the assertion of Proposition 5.3 is a little weaker than [10], because an additional term appears in the bound given in Lemma 5.11.

Proposition 5.3. *There exist stopping times $\tilde{\sigma}^\varepsilon \equiv \tilde{\sigma}^\varepsilon_L, 0 < \varepsilon < 1$, such that $\tilde{\sigma}^\varepsilon > 0$ a.s.,*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} P(\tilde{\sigma}^\varepsilon > T) = 1, \tag{5.20}$$

for every $T > 0$ and

$$\sup_{0<\varepsilon<1} E\left[\sup_{0 \le t \le T} \|\kappa^{(n)}(t \wedge \tilde{\sigma}^\varepsilon)\|^p_{L^p(S)}\right] < \infty, \tag{5.21}$$

for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+ = \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$ and $p \ge 1$, where $\kappa(t) = \kappa^\varepsilon(t)$ is the solution of (5.6).

Proposition 5.4. *For every $\varphi \in C^\infty(S)$ and $p \ge 0$,*

$$E[|\langle \kappa^\varepsilon(t_2) - \kappa^\varepsilon(t_1), \varphi \rangle|^p] \le C(t_2 - t_1)^{p/2}, \qquad 0 \le t_1 < t_2 \le T,$$

where $\langle \kappa, \varphi \rangle = \int_S \kappa(\theta)\varphi(\theta) d\theta$.

Once we have the uniform moment estimates (5.21), relying on the criterion due to Holley and Stroock (see [8]), the conclusion of Theorem 5.2 follows from the weak tightness of $\{\kappa^\varepsilon(t)\}_{0<\varepsilon<1}$ shown in Proposition 5.4. Indeed, (5.21) implies the tightness of $\{\kappa^\varepsilon(t \wedge \tilde{\sigma}^\varepsilon)\}_{0<\varepsilon<1}$ and this shows the conclusion from (5.20).

Proof of Proposition 5.4. We follow the proof of Proposition 4.1 in [10] and only sketch the proof of the proposition. The difference from [10] is that we need to replace $h'(\kappa(t, \theta))$

by $Dh(\theta,\kappa(t))$, the Fréchet derivative in κ. Indeed, the integral form of our equation (5.6) is

$$\kappa(t_2,\cdot)-\kappa(t_1,\cdot)=\int_{t_1}^{t_2}a(\kappa(s,\cdot))\frac{\partial^2\kappa(s,\cdot)}{\partial\theta^2}ds+\int_{t_1}^{t_2}b(\cdot,\kappa(s))ds+\int_{t_1}^{t_2}h(\cdot,\kappa(s))\dot{w}^\varepsilon(s)ds.$$

To complete the proof, it suffices to show

$$E\left[|X(t)|^p\right]\le C(t-t_1)^{\frac{p}{2}},\quad t\ge t_1,\quad p\in 2\mathbb{N},$$

for $X(t)=\int_{t_1}^t\Phi(\kappa(s))\dot{w}^\varepsilon(s)ds, t\ge t_1$, where $\Phi(\kappa)=\int_S h(\theta,\kappa)\varphi(\theta)d\theta$. Since the Fréchet derivatives toward $\psi\in L^2(S)$ of $h(\theta,\kappa)$ and $|\gamma|_L(\kappa)$ are computed as

$$Dh(\theta,\kappa)(\psi)=\frac{2c\alpha\chi_L'(\kappa(\theta))\chi_L(\kappa(\theta))}{|\gamma|_L(\kappa)}\psi(\theta)+\frac{c\alpha\chi_L(\kappa(\theta))^2}{|\gamma|_L(\kappa)^2}\Big\langle\frac{\chi_L'(\kappa)}{\chi_L(\kappa)^2},\psi\Big\rangle, \tag{5.22}$$

$$D|\gamma|_L(\kappa)(\psi)=-\Big\langle\frac{\chi_L'(\kappa)}{\chi_L^2(\kappa)},\psi\Big\rangle, \tag{5.23}$$

respectively, we have

$$X(t)^p=p\int_{t_1}^t\dot{w}^\varepsilon(s)ds\Big[\int_{t_1}^s\Psi_1(r)dr+\int_{t_1}^s\Psi_2(r)\dot{w}^\varepsilon(r)dr\Big],$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_1(r)=&X(r)^{p-1}\Big[\int_S\frac{2c\chi_L'(\kappa(r,\theta))\chi_L(\kappa(r,\theta))}{|\gamma|_L(\kappa(r))}\\&\times\Big(a(\kappa(r,\theta))\frac{\partial^2\kappa(r,\theta)}{\partial\theta^2}+b(\theta,\kappa(r))+h(\theta,\kappa(r))\dot{w}^\varepsilon(r)\Big)\varphi(\theta)d\theta\\&+\int_S\frac{c\chi_L(\kappa(r,\theta))^2}{|\gamma|_L(\kappa(r))^2}\Big\langle\frac{\chi_L'(\kappa(r))}{\chi_L(\kappa(r))^2},a(\kappa(r,\cdot))\frac{\partial^2\kappa(r,\cdot)}{\partial\theta^2}+b(\cdot,\kappa(r))+h(\cdot,\kappa(r))\dot{w}^\varepsilon(r)\Big\rangle\varphi(\theta)d\theta\Big],\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_2(r)=&(p-1)X(r)^{p-2}(\Phi(\kappa(r))^2\\&+X(r)^{p-1}\int_S\Big[\frac{2c\chi_L'(\kappa(r,\theta))\chi_L(\kappa(r,\theta))}{|\gamma|_L(\kappa(r))}h(\theta,\kappa(r))\\&+\frac{c\chi_L(\kappa(r,\theta))^2}{|\gamma|_L(\kappa(r))^2}\Big\langle\frac{\chi_L'(\kappa(r))}{\chi_L(\kappa(r))^2},h(\cdot,\kappa(r))\dot{w}^\varepsilon(r)\Big\rangle\Big]\varphi(\theta)d\theta.\end{aligned}$$

Noting that a, b, h, χ_L and its derivative χ_L' are bounded, similarly to the proof of Proposition 4.1 in [10], the conclusion is shown. □

The proof of Proposition 5.3 can be completed similarly to those of Theorem 6.1 and Lemmas 6.1 to 6.16 in [10]. The difference between [10] and ours is that the coefficients $b=b(\theta,\kappa)$ and $h=h(\theta,\kappa)$ of the SPDE (5.6) are functionals of $\kappa=\{\kappa(\theta);\theta\in S\}$ in our case. This requires some more careful computations, although most of the proof is similar to that in [10]. Another difference is that, in [10], the noise is taken as $\dot{w}^\varepsilon(t)=\varepsilon^{-\gamma}\xi(\varepsilon^{-2\gamma}t)$, $\gamma>0$ with ξ introduced in Section 4.1 and hence $|\dot{w}^\varepsilon(t)|\le M\varepsilon^{-\gamma}$ holds. In our case, $\dot{w}^\varepsilon$

is given by (4.4) and satisfies $|\dot{w}^\varepsilon(t)| \le \frac{M}{A}\psi(\varepsilon)$, where $\psi(\varepsilon)$ is the function of ε defined as (4.1). Therefore, we need to replace $\varepsilon^{-\gamma}$ appearing in lemmas of [10] by $\psi(\varepsilon)$, but we can obtain similar results to that of [10]. Here we indicate only the different points in the proof from that in [10].

Before giving the proof of Proposition 5.3, we prepare several lemmas parallel to [10]. In the rest of this section, we assume $p \in 2\mathbb{N}$. By directly computing from (5.6), we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}||\kappa_t^{(n)}||_{L^p}^p = p\Big(\Phi_1^{(n)}(\kappa_t) + \Phi_2^{(n)}(\kappa_t) + \Phi_3^{(n)}(\kappa_t)\dot{w}^\varepsilon(t)\Big), \tag{5.24}$$

where $L^p = L^p(S)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_1^{(n)}(\kappa) &= \int_S \{\kappa^{(n)}(\theta)\}^{p-1}\{a(\kappa(\theta))\kappa^{(2)}(\theta)\}^{(n)}d\theta,\\
\Phi_2^{(n)}(\kappa) &= \int_S \{\kappa^{(n)}(\theta)\}^{p-1}\{b(\theta,\kappa)\}^{(n)}d\theta,\\
\Phi_3^{(n)}(\kappa) &= \int_S \{\kappa^{(n)}(\theta)\}^{p-1}\{h(\theta,\kappa)\}^{(n)}d\theta.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, $\frac{d}{dt}\Phi_3^{(n)}(\kappa_t)$ can be decomposed into

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Phi_3^{(n)}(\kappa_t) = \Psi_1^{(n)}(\kappa_t) - \Psi_2^{(n)}(\kappa_t)\dot{w}^\varepsilon(t), \tag{5.25}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi_1^{(n)}(\kappa) =&(p-1)\int_S \{\kappa^{(n)}(\theta)\}^{p-2}\{h(\theta,\kappa)\}^{(n)}\{a(\kappa(\theta))\kappa^{(2)}(\theta) + b(\theta,\kappa)\}^{(n)}d\theta\\
&+ \int_S \{\kappa^{(n)}(\theta)\}^{p-1}\Big[Dh(\theta,\kappa)\Big(a(\kappa(\cdot))\kappa^{(2)} + b(\cdot,\kappa)\Big)\Big]^{(n)}d\theta,\\
\Psi_2^{(n)}(\kappa) =&(p-1)\int_S \{\kappa^{(n)}(\theta)\}^{p-2}\Big[\{h(\theta,\kappa)\}^{(n)}\Big]^2 d\theta\\
&+ \int_S \{\kappa^{(n)}(\theta)\}^{p-1}\{Dh(\theta,\kappa)(h(\cdot,\kappa))\}^{(n)}d\theta.
\end{aligned}$$

Set

$$\psi_p^{(n)}(\kappa) = \int_S \{\kappa^{(n)}(\theta)\}^{p-2}\{\kappa^{(n+1)}(\theta)\}^2 d\theta, \quad p \ge 2,\ n \ge 1. \tag{5.26}$$

We denote by $\mathcal{P}_n$ the family of polynomials of the forms $P(y_1,\cdots,y_{n-1},z;\kappa) = \sum_\alpha g_{1,\alpha}(\kappa)g_{2.\alpha}(z)y^\alpha$, $y_i \in \mathbb{R}, 1 \le i \le n-1$, $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$, $z \in L^2(S)$ with $g_{1,\alpha} \in C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, $g_{2,\alpha} \in C_b^\infty(L^2(S))$, $\alpha = (\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{n-1}$, $y^\alpha = y_1^{\alpha_1}\ldots y_{n-1}^{\alpha_{n-1}}$ and the sum $\sum_\alpha$ finite, where $C_b^\infty(L^2(S))$ stands for the family of infinitely Fréchet differentiable functions on $L^2(S)$ having bounded derivatives.

The term $\Phi_1^{(n)}$ coincides with that appearing in [10], Lemma 6.1, so that we have the following lemma.

Lemma 5.5. *(Estimate for $\Phi_1^{(n)}$) For $n \geq 1$, there exist constants $c = c(n,p,L)$ and $C = C(n,p,L) > 0$ such that*

$$\Phi_1^{(n)}(\kappa) \leq -c\psi_p^{(n)}(\kappa) + C\Big\{||\kappa^{(n)}||_{L^p}^p + \sum_{i=1}^{3} ||P_i||_{L^p}^p\Big\}, \tag{5.27}$$

for some $P_i = P_i(\kappa^{(1)}(\theta), \cdots, \kappa^{(n-1)}(\theta), \kappa; \kappa(\theta)) \in \mathcal{P}_n$ with $g_{2,\alpha,i} \equiv 1$, $i = 1,2,3$, that is, P_i of the forms $P_i(y_1, \cdots, y_{n-1}, z; \kappa) = \sum_\alpha g_{1,\alpha,i}(\kappa) y^\alpha$ with $g_{1,\alpha,i} \in C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, $i = 1,2,3$. In particular, in the case $n = 1$, (5.27) holds with $C = 0$ and $P_1 = P_2 = P_3 = 0$.

As for the terms $\Phi_2^{(n)}$ and $\Phi_3^{(n)}$, we have the upper bounds for them as in the next lemma.

Lemma 5.6. *(Estimates for $\Phi_2^{(n)}$ and $\Phi_3^{(n)}$) For $n \geq 1$, there exists a constant $C = C(n,p,L) > 0$ such that*

$$|\Phi_2^{(n)}(\kappa)| \leq C\Big\{||\kappa^{(n)}||_{L^p}^p + ||P_4||_{L^p}^p\Big\},$$
$$|\Phi_3^{(n)}(\kappa)| \leq C\Big\{||\kappa^{(n)}||_{L^p}^p + ||P_5||_{L^p}^p\Big\},$$

for some $P_i = P_i(\kappa^{(1)}(\theta), \cdots, \kappa^{(n-1)}(\theta), \kappa; \kappa(\theta)) \in \mathcal{P}_n$, $i = 4,5$. In particular, in the case $n = 1$, these estimates hold with $P_4 = P_5 = 0$.

Proof. We give only the sketch of the proof. By induction in n, we get

$$\{h(\theta,\kappa)\}^{(n)} = \partial_{\kappa(\theta)} h(\theta,\kappa)\kappa^{(n)}(\theta) + P(\kappa^{(1)}(\theta), \cdots, \kappa^{(n-1)}(\theta), \kappa; \kappa(\theta)),$$

for some P. Here $\partial_{\kappa(\theta)} h(\theta,\kappa)$ is defined as follows. As in (5.4), $h(\theta,\kappa)$ is the product of a function of $\kappa(\theta)$ and a functional of κ: $h(\theta,\kappa) = h_1(\kappa(\theta)) \cdot h_2(\kappa)$ with $h_1(x) = c\alpha\chi_L^2(x)$ and $h_2(\kappa) = |\gamma|_L^{-1}$. Then $\partial_{\kappa(\theta)} h(\theta,\kappa) := \frac{\partial h_1}{\partial x}(\kappa(\theta)) \cdot h_2(\kappa)$. Recalling the definition of the cutoff functions b and h given in (5.4), the derivatives $\partial_{\kappa(\theta)}^l h(\theta,\kappa)$ and $\partial_{\kappa(\theta)}^l b(\theta,\kappa)$, $l \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, are all bounded. The rest of the proof is similar to that of [10], Lemma 6.2. □

We have another estimate for $\Phi_3^{(n)}(\kappa)$. In what follows, $\psi(\varepsilon)$ denotes the function given in (4.1).

Lemma 5.7. *For every $n \geq 1$ and $\delta > 0$,*

$$|\Phi_3^{(n)}(\kappa)| \leq \psi(\varepsilon)^{-1}(p-1)\Big[\delta\psi_p^{(n)}(\kappa) + \delta^{-1}||\kappa^{(n)}||_{L^p}^p + \delta^{-1}\psi(\varepsilon)^p||P_6||_{L^p}^p\Big],$$

for some $P_6 = P_6(\kappa^{(1)}(\theta), \cdots, \kappa^{(n-1)}(\theta), \kappa; \kappa(\theta)) \in \mathcal{P}_n$.

Proof. The proof is given by a similar method to that of [10], Lemma 6.3. Take $P_6 = \{h(\theta,\kappa)\}^{(n-1)}$. Then, using $ab \leq (a^2+b^2)/2$ for $a = \kappa^{(n-1)}(\theta)\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}\psi(\varepsilon)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and $b = P_6\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}\psi(\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, we easily get the assertion. □

Next, we give a bound for $\Psi_2^{(n)}$ for $n \geq 1$.

Lemma 5.8. *(Estimate for $\Psi_2^{(n)}$) For $n \geq 1$, there exists a constant $C = C(n,p,L) > 0$ such that*

$$|\Psi_2^{(n)}(\kappa)| \leq C\Big[||\kappa^{(n)}||_{L^p}^p + \sum_{i=7}^{8} ||P_i||_{L^p}^p\Big],$$

for some $P_i = P_i(\kappa^{(1)}(\theta), \cdots, \kappa^{(n-1)}(\theta), \kappa; \kappa(\theta)) \in \mathcal{P}_n$, $i = 7, 8$.

Proof. We use the idea of [10], Lemma 6.4. The assertion is shown by noting that

$$\begin{aligned}\{Dh(\theta,\kappa)(h(\cdot,\kappa))\}^{(n)} &= \{\partial_{\kappa(\theta)}\Big(Dh(\theta,\kappa)(h(\cdot,\kappa))\Big)\}\kappa^{(n)}(\theta) \\ &\quad + P_8(\kappa^{(1)}(\theta), \cdots, \kappa^{(n-1)}(\theta), \kappa; \kappa(\theta)).\end{aligned}$$

We omit the details, since the other parts are the same as [10], Lemma 6.4. □

Let us give an estimate for $\Psi_1^{(n)}$. We start with the case $n = 1$.

Lemma 5.9. *For every $\delta > 0$, we have*

$$|\Psi_1^{(1)}(\kappa)| \leq C\Big[1 + ||\kappa^{(1)}||_{L^p}^p + \psi(\varepsilon)^{-1}\delta^{-1}||\kappa^{(1)}||_{L^{p+2}}^{p+2} + (1+\psi(\varepsilon)\delta)\psi_p^{(1)}(\kappa)\Big],$$

for some $C = C(1,p,L) > 0$.

Proof. The proof is based on that of [10], Lemma 6.5. Using the integration by parts formula, we have

$$\Psi_1^{(1)}(\kappa) = I + II + III,$$

where, writing $\kappa' = \kappa^{(1)}$ and $\kappa'' = \kappa^{(2)}$ for simplicity,

$$\begin{aligned}I &= -(p-1)^2 \int_S \{\kappa'(\theta)\}^{p-2}\{\kappa''(\theta)\}\partial_{\kappa(\theta)}h(\theta,\kappa)A(\theta,\kappa)d\theta, \\ II &= -(p-1)\int_S \{\kappa'(\theta)\}^p \partial_{\kappa(\theta)}^2 h(\theta,\kappa)A(\theta,\kappa)d\theta, \\ III &= -(p-1)\int_S \{\kappa'(\theta)\}^{p-2}\{\kappa''(\theta)\}Dh(\theta,\kappa)(A(\cdot,\kappa))d\theta, \\ A(\theta,\kappa) &\equiv a(\kappa(\theta))\kappa''(\theta) + b(\theta,\kappa).\end{aligned}$$

Estimates on I and II are similar to those in the proof of [10], Lemma 6.5. It therefore suffices to give the estimate on III. From (5.22), we have

$$Dh(\theta,\kappa)(A(\cdot,\kappa)) = \frac{2c\alpha\chi_L'(\kappa(\theta))\chi_L(\kappa(\theta))}{|\gamma|_L(\kappa)}A(\theta,\kappa) + \frac{c\alpha\chi_L(\kappa(\theta))^2}{|\gamma|_L(\kappa)^2}\Big\langle\frac{\chi_L'(\kappa)}{\chi_L(\kappa)^2}, A(\cdot,\kappa)\Big\rangle.$$

The contribution to III of the first term of $Dh(\theta,\kappa)(A(\cdot,\kappa))$ can be estimated similarly to [10], Lemma 6.5. For the second term, since we have by the integration by parts

$$\Big|\Big\langle\frac{\chi_L'(\kappa)}{\chi_L(\kappa)^2}, A(\cdot,\kappa)\Big\rangle\Big| \leq C\|\kappa'\|_{L^2}^2, \tag{5.28}$$

the contribution to III of the second term is estimated by

$$C(p-1)\|\kappa'\|_{L^2}^2 \int_S \big|(\kappa')^{p-2}\kappa''\big| d\theta. \tag{5.29}$$

However, by Schwarz's inequality, the above integral is bounded by

$$\int_S \big|(\kappa')^{\frac{p-2}{2}} \cdot (\kappa')^{\frac{p-2}{2}}\kappa''\big| d\theta \le \Big(\int_S |\kappa'|^{p-2} d\theta\Big)^{1/2} (\psi_p^{(1)}(\kappa))^{1/2} = \|\kappa'\|_{L^{p-2}}^{\frac{p-2}{2}} (\psi_p^{(1)}(\kappa))^{1/2},$$

if $p \ge 3$ and this is obvious in the case of $p = 2$ by regarding $\|\kappa'\|_{L^{p-2}}^{\frac{p-2}{2}} = (2\pi)^{1/2}$. Therefore, (5.29) dropped the constant $C(p-1)$ is bounded by

$$C_p \|\kappa'\|_{L^{p+2}}^{\frac{p+2}{2}} (\psi_p^{(1)}(\kappa))^{1/2} \le \frac{C_p}{2} \big\{ \psi(\varepsilon)^{-1} \delta^{-1} \|\kappa'\|_{L^{p+2}}^{p+2} + \psi(\varepsilon)\delta\, \psi_p^{(1)}(\kappa) \big\},$$

where we have used $\|\kappa'\|_{L^2} \le c_p \|\kappa'\|_{L^{p+2}}$ and $\|\kappa'\|_{L^{p-2}} \le c_p \|\kappa'\|_{L^{p+2}}$ with some $c_p > 0$, and set $C_p = c_p^{\frac{p+2}{2}}$. This completes the proof. □

Next we consider the the case $n \ge 2$. For $n \ge 2$, the integration by parts formula for $\Psi_1^{(n)}$, it can be decomposed into

$$\Psi_1^{(n)}(\kappa) = -(p-1)(p-2)\Psi_a^{(n)}(\kappa) - (p-1)\Psi_b^{(n)}(\kappa) - (p-1)\Psi_c^{(n)}(\kappa),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi_a^{(n)}(\kappa) &= \int_S \{\kappa^{(n)}(\theta)\}^{p-3} \kappa^{(n+1)}(\theta) \{h(\theta,\kappa)\}^{(n)} \{A(\theta,\kappa)\}^{(n-1)} d\theta, \\
\Psi_b^{(n)}(\kappa) &= \int_S \{\kappa^{(n)}(\theta)\}^{p-2} \{h(\theta,\kappa)\}^{(n+1)} \{A(\theta,\kappa)\}^{(n-1)} d\theta, \\
\Psi_c^{(n)}(\kappa) &= \int_S \{\kappa^{(n)}(\theta)\}^{p-2} \kappa^{(n+1)}(\theta) \Big[Dh(\theta,\kappa)(A(\cdot,\kappa)) \Big]^{(n-1)} d\theta.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we have the following three lemmas for $\Psi_b^{(n)}$, $\Psi_c^{(n)}$ and $\Psi_a^{(n)}$.

Lemma 5.10. *(Estimate on $\Psi_b^{(n)}$) For $n \ge 2$, there exists a constant $C = C(n,p,L) > 0$ such that*

$$|\Psi_b^{(n)}(\kappa)| \le C \Big[\psi_p^{(n)}(\kappa) + ||\kappa^{(n)}||_{L^p}^p + \sum_{i=9}^{12} ||P_i||_{L^p}^p \Big],$$

for some $P_i = P_i(\kappa^{(1)}(\theta), \cdots, \kappa^{(n-1)}(\theta), \kappa; \kappa(\theta)) \in \mathcal{P}_n$, $i = 9, \ldots, 12$.

Proof. The proof is similar to [10], Lemma 6.6 by noting that

$$\begin{aligned}
\{h(\theta,\kappa)\}^{(n+1)} =& \partial_{\kappa(\theta)} h(\theta,\kappa) \kappa^{(n+1)}(\theta) + (n+1)\partial_{\kappa(\theta)}^2 h(\theta,\kappa) \kappa^{(1)}(\theta) \kappa^{(n)}(\theta) \\
&+ Q_1(\kappa^{(1)}(\theta), \cdots, \kappa^{(n-1)}(\theta), \kappa; \kappa(\theta))
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\{A(\theta,\kappa)\}^{(n-1)} = a(\kappa(\theta))\kappa^{(n+1)}(\theta) + (n-1)a'(\kappa(\theta))\kappa^{(1)}(\theta)\kappa^{(n)}(\theta) + Q_2(\kappa^{(1)}(\theta),\cdots,\kappa^{(n-1)}(\theta),\kappa;\kappa(\theta)),$$

where $Q_i(\kappa^{(1)}(\theta),\cdots,\kappa^{(n-1)}(\theta),\kappa;\kappa(\theta)) \in \mathcal{P}_n$, $i=1,2$; recall that $\partial^l_{\kappa(\theta)}h(\theta,\kappa)$ and $\partial^l_{\kappa(\theta)}b(\theta,\kappa)$, $l \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, are all bounded. The rest of the proof is the same as [10], Lemma 6.6. □

The following estimate is similar to [10], Lemma 6.7, but we need the second term additionally for this estimate.

Lemma 5.11. *(Estimate on $\Psi_c^{(n)}$) For $n \geq 2$, there exists a constant $C = C(n,p,L) > 0$ such that*

$$|\Psi_c^{(n)}(\kappa)| \leq C\Big[\psi_p^{(n)}(\kappa) + ||\kappa^{(n)}||^p_{L^p} + \sum_{i=13}^{15}||P_i||^p_{L^p}\Big] + C||\kappa^{(1)}||^4_{L^2}\Big(||\kappa^{(n)}||^p_{L^p} + ||Q||^p_{L^p}\Big),$$

for some $P_i = P_i(\kappa^{(1)}(\theta),\cdots,\kappa^{(n-1)}(\theta),\kappa;\kappa(\theta)) \in \mathcal{P}_n$, $i = 13,14,15$ and $Q = Q(\kappa^{(1)}(\theta),\cdots,\kappa^{(n-1)}(\theta),\kappa;\kappa(\theta)) \in \mathcal{P}_n$ with $g_{2,\alpha} \equiv 1$, namely, Q does not contain any functional of κ.

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 5.9, $Dh(\theta,\kappa)(A(\cdot,\kappa))$ is the sum of two terms. The contribution to $\Psi_c^{(n)}$ of $(n-1)$th derivative of its first term, i.e., $\frac{2c\alpha}{|\gamma|_L(\kappa)}\Big\{\chi_L'(\kappa(\theta))\chi_L(\kappa(\theta))A(\theta,\kappa)\Big\}^{(n-1)}$, can be estimated similarly to [10], Lemma 6.7 by noting again $\partial^j_{\kappa(\theta)}h(\theta,\kappa)$, $j=1,2$ and a, b, h are all bounded, and we see that it is estimated by the first term in the right hand side of the bound stated in the claim of this lemma. On the other hand, the contribution to $\Psi_c^{(n)}$ of its second term is given by

$$J = \frac{c\alpha}{|\gamma|_L(\kappa)^2}\Big\langle\frac{\chi_L'(\kappa)}{\chi_L(\kappa)^2}, A(\cdot,\kappa)\Big\rangle\int_S\{\kappa^{(n)}(\theta)\}^{p-2}\kappa^{(n+1)}(\theta)Q\,d\theta,$$

where $Q \equiv Q(\theta) = \{\chi_L(\kappa(\theta))^2\}^{(n-1)}$. Then, J is estimated as

$$\begin{aligned}|J| &\leq C\|\kappa'\|^2_{L^2}\Big|\int_S\{\kappa^{(n)}(\theta)\}^{p-2}\kappa^{(n+1)}(\theta)Q\,d\theta\Big| \\ &\leq C\|\kappa'\|^2_{L^2}\,\psi_p^{(n)}(\kappa)^{1/2}\Big(\int_S|\kappa^{(n)}(\theta)|^{p-2}Q^2\,d\theta\Big)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \psi_p^{(n)}(\kappa) + \frac{C^2}{4}\|\kappa'\|^4_{L^2}\Big(\|\kappa^{(n)}\|^p_{L^p} + \|Q\|^p_{L^p}\Big),\end{aligned}$$

where we have used (5.28) noting $1/|\gamma|_L(\kappa)$ is bounded for the first line, Schwarz's inequality for the second and finally a trivial inequality $a^{p-2}b^2 \leq a^p + b^p$ for $a,b \geq 0$ for the third. Thus, the proof is complete. □

Recalling again that $\partial^l_{\kappa(\theta)}h(\theta,\kappa)$ and $\partial^l_{\kappa(\theta)}b(\theta,\kappa)$, $l \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, are all bounded and following the proof of [10], Lemma 6.9, we have the next lemma.

Lemma 5.12. *(Estimate on $\Psi_a^{(n)}$) For every $n \geq 2$ and $\beta' \in (0,1)$, there exist constants $C, N, q > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned}|\Psi_a^{(n)}(\kappa)| \leq & C\Big[\psi_p^{(n)}(\kappa) + ||\kappa^{(n)}||_{L^p}^p + \sum_{i=16}^{19} ||P_i||_{L^p}^p\Big] \\ & + C\Big[1 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} ||\kappa^{(i)}||_{L^p}^N + ||\kappa^{(n)}||_{L^q}^{\beta'}\Big]\psi_2^{(n)}(\kappa),\end{aligned}$$

for some $P_i = P_i(\kappa^{(1)}(\theta), \cdots, \kappa^{(n-1)}(\theta), \kappa; \kappa(\theta)) \in \mathcal{P}_n$, $i = 16, \ldots, 19$.

Now we estimate the conditional expectation of the integral of the third term on the right hand side of (5.24). Let us recall $\mathcal{F}_{s,t} = \sigma(\xi(u), u \in [s,t])$, where ξ is the stochastic process given in Section 4.1. Set $\mathcal{F}_{s,t}^{\varepsilon} = \mathcal{F}_{\psi(\varepsilon)^2 s, \psi(\varepsilon)^2 t}$. Recall also that in our case $\dot{w}^{\varepsilon}$ is given by (4.4) and $|\dot{w}^{\varepsilon}(t)| \leq \frac{M}{A}\psi(\varepsilon)$ holds. By replacing the divergent factor $\varepsilon^{-\gamma}$ in [10], Lemmas 6.10 and 6.11 by $\psi(\varepsilon)$, we obtain the following two lemmas. The proofs are same and therefore omitted.

Lemma 5.13. *For $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|E\Big[\int_s^t \Phi_3^{(n)}(\kappa_r)\dot{w}^{\varepsilon}(r)dr\Big|\mathcal{F}_{0,s}^{\varepsilon}\Big]\right| \\ &\leq C\psi(\varepsilon)^{-1}|\Phi_3^{(n)}(\kappa_s)| + C\int_s^t E\Big[\psi(\varepsilon)^{-1}|\Psi_1^{(n)}(\kappa_r)| + |\Psi_2^{(n)}(\kappa_r)|\Big|\mathcal{F}_{0,s}^{\varepsilon}\Big]dr,\end{aligned}$$

for some $C = C(M, A) > 0$.

Lemma 5.14. *(Rough estimates uniform in ω) Assume $\kappa_0 = \kappa(0) \in C^{\infty}(S)$ is independent of ε. Then, there exist constants $C = C(T, n, p)$ and $N = N(n, p) > 0$ such that*

$$||\kappa_t^{(n)}||_{L^p} \leq C\psi(\varepsilon)^N, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \tag{5.30}$$

$$\int_0^T \psi_p^{(n)}(\kappa_t)dt \leq C\psi(\varepsilon)^N, \tag{5.31}$$

$$||\kappa_t^{(n)}||_{L^p}^p \leq \Big[||\kappa_s^{(n)}||_{L^p}^p + C\psi(\varepsilon)\int_s^t \sum_{i=1}^{5} ||P_i(\kappa_r)||_{L^p}^p dr\Big]e^{C\psi(\varepsilon)(t-s)},$$

for $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$. In particular, if $n = 1$, we can take $N = 1$ in (5.30) and $N = p$ in (5.31), that is,

$$\begin{aligned}&||\kappa_t^{(1)}||_{L^p}^p \leq C\psi(\varepsilon), \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \\ &\int_0^T \psi_p^{(1)}(\kappa_t)dt \leq C\psi(\varepsilon)^p.\end{aligned}$$

Under the preparation of Lemmas 5.5 to 5.14, one can complete the proof of Proposition 5.3.

Proof of Proposition 5.3. The proof of (5.21) is completed by induction in the following three steps as in [10] Section 6.7. Step 1: we prove (5.21) for $n = 1$. Step 2: we prove (5.21) for n assuming that it holds for $i = 1, \cdots, n-1$. Step 3: we prove (5.21) for $n = 0$.

As for Step 1, using the estimates on $\Phi_1^{(1)}$, $\Phi_2^{(1)}$, $\Phi_3^{(1)}$, $\Psi_1^{(1)}$ and $\Psi_2^{(1)}$, a similar method to [10] shows

$$\sup_{0<\varepsilon<1} E\Big[\sup_{t\in[0,T]} ||\kappa_t^{(1)}||_{L^p}^p\Big] < \infty. \tag{5.32}$$

In Step 2, integrating the both sides of (5.24) from s to t and taking the conditional expectation, and then, using Lemmas 5.5 to 5.14 and noting that $|\dot{w}^\varepsilon(t)|$ satisfies $|\dot{w}^\varepsilon(t)| \le \frac{M}{A}\psi(\varepsilon)$, we have

(5.33)

$$\begin{aligned}
&E\Big[||\kappa_t^{(n)}||_{L^p}^p\Big|\mathcal{F}_{0,s}^\varepsilon\Big] + c'' \int_s^t E\Big[\psi_p^{(n)}(\kappa_r)\Big|\mathcal{F}_{0,s}^\varepsilon\Big]dr \\
&\le (1 + C\psi(\varepsilon)^{-1})||\kappa_s^{(n)}||_{L^p}^p + C\psi(\varepsilon)^{-1}||P_5(\kappa_s)||_{L^p}^p \\
&\quad + C\int_s^t E\Big[||\kappa_r^{(n)}||_{L^p}^p\Big|\mathcal{F}_{0,s}^\varepsilon\Big]dr + C\int_s^t E\Big[\mathcal{P}(\kappa_r)\Big|\mathcal{F}_{0,s}^\varepsilon\Big]dr \\
&\quad + C\psi(\varepsilon)^{-1}\int_s^t E\Big[||\kappa_r^{(1)}||_{L^2}^4||\kappa_r^{(n)}||_{L^p}^p\Big|\mathcal{F}_{0,s}^\varepsilon\Big]dr + C\psi(\varepsilon)^{-1}\int_s^t E\Big[||\kappa_r^{(1)}||_{L^2}^4||Q(\kappa_r)||_{L^p}^p\Big|\mathcal{F}_{0,s}^\varepsilon\Big]dr \\
&\quad + C\psi(\varepsilon)^{-1}(p-2)\int_s^t E\Big[\Big\{1 + \psi(\varepsilon)^\delta + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1}||\kappa_r^{(i)}||_{L^q}^N\Big\}\psi_2^{(n)}(\kappa_r)\Big|\mathcal{F}_{0,s}^\varepsilon\Big]dr,
\end{aligned}$$

for every $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ with a sufficiently small ε_0 in such a way that $\frac{C}{c}\psi(\varepsilon_0)^{-1} \ll 1$, (hence, there exists some $c'' > 0$), for every $\delta > 0$ and some $N = N(\delta)$, $q = q(\delta) \ge 1$, where $\mathcal{P}(\kappa_t) = \sum_{1\le i\le 19, i\ne 5,6}||P_i(\kappa_t)||_{L^p}^p$. Let us define $\tilde{\sigma}_\varepsilon = \inf\{t > s;\, ||\kappa_t^{(1)}||_{L^2} > \psi(\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{4}}\}$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_\varepsilon = \infty$ if the set $\{\cdot\}$ is empty. Then, the estimate (5.32) implies (5.20). Note that (5.33) is also true with t replaced by $t \wedge \tilde{\sigma}_\varepsilon$. Thus, by similar manner to [10], Section 6.7 with $\varepsilon^{-\gamma}$ replaced by $\psi(\varepsilon)$, we have

$$\sup_{0<\varepsilon<1} E\Big[\sup_{t\in[0,T]} ||\kappa_{t\wedge\tilde{\sigma}_\varepsilon}^{(n)}||_{L^p}^p\Big] < \infty,$$

see [10], Lemmas 6.12 to 6.16. Finally, Step 3 can be completed by using again Lemmas 5.5 to 5.14 for the estimates on $\Phi_1^{(0)}$, $\Phi_2^{(0)}$, $\Phi_3^{(0)}$, $\Psi_1^{(0)}$ and $\Psi_2^{(0)}$. Indeed, we obtain

$$\sup_{0<\varepsilon<1} E\Big[\sup_{t\in[0,T]} ||\kappa_t||_{L^p}^p\Big] < \infty.$$

As a result, we get (5.21) for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $p \in 2\mathbb{N}$, so that for every $p \ge 1$. □

We now show the pathwise uniqueness for (5.5). For this, we apply the energy inequality, cf. Lemma 5.2 in [10]. To do this, we need to rewrite (5.5) into Itô's form. The Fréchet derivatives toward $\psi \in L^2(S)$ of $h(\theta, \kappa)$ and $|\gamma|_L(\kappa)$ are computed as in (5.22) and (5.23), respectively. Thus, we have that

$$h(\theta, \kappa(t)) \circ dw_t = h(\theta, \kappa(t))dw_t + \frac{1}{2}d\{h(\theta, \kappa(t))\}dw_t$$

$$= h(\theta,\kappa(t))dw_t + \frac{1}{2}\left(\int_S Dh(\theta,\kappa(t))(\theta_1)h(\theta_1,\kappa(t))d\theta_1\right)dt$$
$$= h(\theta,\kappa(t))dw_t + g(\theta,\kappa(t))dt,$$

where

$$g(\theta,\kappa) = -\frac{c\alpha}{|\gamma|_L(\kappa)}\chi_L(\kappa(\theta))\chi_L'(\kappa(\theta))h(\theta,\kappa) + \frac{c\alpha}{2|\gamma|_L(\kappa)^2}\chi_L^2(\kappa(\theta))\int_S \frac{\chi_L'(\kappa(\theta_1))h(\theta_1,\kappa)}{\chi_L^2(\kappa(\theta_1))}d\theta_1.$$

Therefore, (5.5) can be rewritten into Itô's form:

$$\frac{\partial\kappa}{\partial t} = a(\kappa)\frac{\partial^2\kappa}{\partial\theta^2} + \tilde{b}(\cdot,\kappa) + h(\cdot,\kappa)\dot{w}_t, \quad t>0,\ \theta\in S, \tag{5.34}$$

where

$$\tilde{b}(\cdot,\kappa) = b(\cdot,\kappa) + g(\cdot,\kappa).$$

Proposition 5.15. *(cf. Lemma 5.2 in [10]) Let $\kappa_i(t), i=1,2$, be two solutions of (5.5) or equivalently (5.34) satisfying $\kappa_i(t)\in C([0,T],C^2(S))$ a.s. and having the same initial data: $\kappa_1(0)=\kappa_2(0)\in C^2(S)$. Then, we have $P(\kappa_1(t)=\kappa_2(t)$ for all $t\in[0,T])=1$.*

Proof. By applying Itô's formula,

$$\|\kappa_1(t)-\kappa_2(t)\|_{L^2}^2 = \int_0^t \{I_1+I_2\}\,ds + \int_0^t I_3\,dw_s,$$

where

$$I_1 = 2\int(\kappa_1-\kappa_2)\{a(\kappa_1)\kappa_1^{(2)} - a(\kappa_2)\kappa_2^{(2)}\},$$
$$I_2 = 2\int(\kappa_1-\kappa_2)\{\tilde{b}(\cdot,\kappa_1)-\tilde{b}(\cdot,\kappa_2)\} + \|h(\cdot,\kappa_1)-h(\cdot,\kappa_2)\|_{L^2}^2,$$
$$I_3 = 2\int(\kappa_1-\kappa_2)\{h(\cdot,\kappa_1)-h(\cdot,\kappa_2)\},$$

and the norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^p(S)}$ will be simply denoted by $\|\cdot\|_{L^p}$ for $p\in[1,\infty]$. Noting that $a(\kappa)\geq a_0 = 1/2N > 0$, the estimate on I_1 is exactly the same as in [10]:

$$I_1 \leq -2a_0\|\kappa_1'-\kappa_2'\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\|a'\|_{L^\infty}\|\kappa_1'\|_{L^\infty}\{\delta^{-1}\|\kappa_1-\kappa_2\|_{L^2}^2 + \delta\|\kappa_1'-\kappa_2'\|_{L^2}^2\} + 2\|a'\|_{L^\infty}\|\kappa_2^{(2)}\|_{L^\infty}\|\kappa_1-\kappa_2\|_{L^2}^2,$$

for every $\delta>0$. Since $D\{1/|\gamma|_L\}(\theta_1,\kappa) = -\frac{1}{|\gamma|_L^2}D|\gamma|_L(\theta_1,\kappa)$, (5.23) shows that $\|D\{1/|\gamma|_L\}(\cdot,\kappa)\|_{L^2}$ is bounded in κ and thus the map $\kappa\in L^2\mapsto 1/|\gamma|_L(\kappa)\in\mathbb{R}$ is Lipschitz continuous. This implies that

$$I_2 \leq C\|\kappa_1-\kappa_2\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Now introduce a stopping time

$$\tau_M = \inf\left\{t>0; \max\{\|\kappa_1\|_{L^\infty},\|\kappa_2\|_{L^\infty},\|\kappa_1^{(1)}\|_{L^\infty},\|\kappa_2^{(2)}\|_{L^\infty}\}>M\right\},\quad M>0.$$

Then, by choosing $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small, we have

$$\|\kappa_1(t\wedge\tau_M)-\kappa_2(t\wedge\tau_M)\|_{L^2}^2 \le C_M \int_0^t \|\kappa_1(s\wedge\tau_M)-\kappa_2(s\wedge\tau_M)\|_{L^2}^2\, ds + \int_0^{t\wedge\tau_M} I_3\, dw_s, \quad t > 0,$$

for some $C_M > 0$. Therefore, taking the expectation of both sides and applying the Gronwall's lemma, we obtain

$$E[\|\kappa_1(t \wedge \tau_M) - \kappa_2(t \wedge \tau_M)\|_{L^2}^2] = 0$$

for all $M > 0$. This completes the proof of the proposition. □

The pathwise uniqueness combined with the existence of the solution in law sense implies the existence of a strong solution. This is the well-known Yamada-Watanabe's theorem which is extended into an infinite-dimensional setting by [19], see also [20]. As a result, we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 5.16. *Let D be a two-dimensional bounded domain and γ_0 be a closed convex curve given such that $\gamma \Subset D$. Let $\kappa_0(\theta)$, $\theta \in S$ be the curvature of γ_0. Then, there exists a unique local solution $\kappa = \kappa(t, \theta)$ defined for $0 \le t < \sigma$ and $\theta \in S$ of the SPDE* (5.1)*, where $\sigma > 0$ (a.s.) is a stopping time. In particular, the dynamics* (1.4) *has a unique solution for $0 \le t < \sigma$.*

Theorem 5.2 together with the remarks made before it combined with Theorem 5.16, which implies the uniqueness in law, shows that Assumption 1.2 holds in law sense in the setting of this section.

Acknowledgement. The authors thank Danielle Hilhorst for leading them to the problem discussed in this article and stimulating discussions.

References

[1] G. Bellettini, *Lecture notes on mean curvature flow, barriers and singular perturbations*, Appunti. Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa (Nuova Serie), **12**, Pisa, (2013).

[2] X. Chen, *Spectrum for the Allen-Cahn, Cahn-Hilliard, and phase-field equations for generic interfaces*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, **19** (1994), 1371–1395.

[3] X. Chen, D. Hilhorst, E. Logak, *Mass conserving Allen-Cahn equation and volume preserving mean curvature flow*, Interfaces Free Bound., **12** (2010), 527–549.

[4] C.M. Elliott and H. Garcke, *Existence results for diffusive surface motion laws*, Adv. Math. Sci. Appl., **7** (1997), 467–490.

[5] J. Escher and G. Simonett, *The volume preserving mean curvature flow near spheres*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **126** (1998), 2789–2796.

[6] P.C. Fife and L. Hsiao, *The generation and propagation of internal layers*, Nonlinear Anal., **12** (1988), 19–41.

[7] A. Friedman, *Partial differential equations of parabolic type*, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 1964.

[8] T. Funaki, *A stochastic partial differential equation with values in a manifold*, J. Func. Anal., **109** (1992), 257–288.

[9] T. Funaki, *The scaling limit for a stochastic PDE and the separation of phases*, Probab. Theory Relat. Fields, **102** (1995), 221–288.

[10] T. Funaki, *Singular limit for stochastic reaction-diffusion equation and generation of random interfaces*, Acta Math. Sin. (Engl. Ser.), **15** (1999), 407–438.

[11] T. Funaki, *Stochastic models for phase separation and evolution equations of interfaces* [translation of Sûgaku 50 (1998), 68–85], Sugaku Expositions, **16** (2003), 97–116.

[12] T. Funaki, *Lectures on Random Interfaces*, to appear in SpringerBriefs in Probability and Mathematical Statistics, Springer, 2016.

[13] J. Gärtner, *Bistable reaction-diffusion equations and excitable media*, Math. Nachr., **112** (1983), 125-152.

[14] M.E. Gurtin, *Thermomechanics of evolving phase boundaries in the plane*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1993.

[15] D. Hilhorst, H. Matano, T.N. Nguyen and H. Weber, *On the large time behavior of the solutions of a nonlocal ordinary differential equation with mass conservation*, arXiv:1501.05103.

[16] G. Huisken, *The volume preserving mean curvature flow*, J. Reine Angew. Math., **382** (1987), 35–48.

[17] G.M. Lieberman, *Second order parabolic differential equations*, World Scientific, 1996.

[18] P.L. Lions and P.E. Souganidis, *Fully nonlinear stochastic partial differential equations: non-smooth equations and applications*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Ser. I Math., **327** (1998), 735–741.

[19] M. Ondreját, *Uniqueness for stochastic evolution equations in Banach spaces*, Dissertationes Math., **426** (2004), 63 pp.

[20] S. Tappe, *The Yamada-Watanabe theorem for mild solutions to stochastic partial differential equations*, Electron. Commun. Probab., **18** (2013), 1–13.

[21] H. Weber, *On the short time asymptotic of the stochastic Allen-Cahn equation*, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincare Probab. Stat., **46** (2010), 965–975.